This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UC-NRLF
$B 84 396
DC
173
.62
P3

EXCHANGE

SIGILLVM · VNIVERSITATIS · CALIFORNIENSIS

FIAT LVX

MDCCCLXVIII

EX LIBRIS

THE

UPRISING OF JUNE 20, 1792

BY

LAURA B. PFEIFFER

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE ACADEMIC COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

LINCOLN, NEB.
1913

Digitized by Google

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

D. I. S.

TO

HER TEACHER AND FRIEND

FRED MORROW FLING, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF EUROPEAN HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

TO WHOSE LARGE, VARIED AND ACCURATE LEARNING, MASTERLY HISTORICAL METHOD, AND DEVOTION TO SCHOLARLY IDEALS SHE IS INDEBTED FOR THE BEST IN WHAT SHE HAS WROUGHT, THIS WORK IS AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED BY

THE AUTHOR

288011

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

[Reprinted from UNIVERSITY STUDIES, Vol. XII, No. 3, 1913.]

THE UPRISING OF JUNE 20, 1792

BY LAURA B. PFEIFFER

CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introduction 199
Chapter II. The Decrees of the Assembly 207
Chapter III. The Fall of the Girondist Ministry 215
Chapter IV. The Feuillant Ministry 221
Chapter V. The 20th of June 226

OUTLINE

I. Introduction 199
A. Struggle between the king and French people 200
1. The calling of the states-general 200
2. Struggle between "divine right" and sovereignty of the people 201
a. Oath of the Tennis Court 201
b. The destruction of the Bastille 202
c. The 4th of August decrees 202
d. The declaration of rights 202
e. Calling of the regiment of Flanders 202
f. King's intrigue with foreign powers 203
g. Attempted flight of the king 203
h. Declaration of war on Austria 205
i. The decrees of the assembly 206
j. The fall of the Girondist ministry 206
k. The uprising of the 20th of June 206
II. The decrees of the assembly 207
A. Led to a clash with the king 207
B. Needed for public safety 208
C. Three decrees passed 209
1. Decree against the priests 209

Digitized by Google

2. Decree dissolving king's guard 209
3. Decree for 20,000 *fédérés* 212
D. The king vetoes the decrees 214
1. Popular feeling aroused 215
III. The fall of the Girondist ministry 215
A. Ministry urges king to sanction decrees 216
B. Roland's letter to the king 217
1. Insists on king's sanction 218
2. Offends the king 218
C. The ministry dismissed 219
1. The people indignant 220
a. Demand its recall 220
D. Dumouriez retained in the ministry 220
1. King still refuses sanction 220
2. Dumouriez resigns 221
IV. The Feuillant ministry 221
A. Dominated by Lafayette 221
B. Lafayette's letters 221
1. To the assembly 221
a. A threatening tone 222
b. Arouses indignation of France 222
2. To the king 223
a. Urges him to maintain veto 223
C. King's veto announced, June 19 225
1. Great indignation in Paris 225
2. Leads to the uprising 225
V. The 20th of June 226
A. The plan formed 234
1. The meeting with Santerre 234
a. To plant a liberty tree 235
b. To present petition to king and assembly .. 235
B. The action of the authorities 236
1. Council refuses permission to march 238
2. The mayor is indifferent 239
C. The night of June 19–20 240
1. The department decree against the movement .. 241
2. The sections sit all night 243
3. Mayor forced to act by directory 246
a. Calls municipality for morning 247
D. The morning of June 20 247
1. The directory remains firm 248
2. Mayor acts under pressure 249
a. Commands chiefs not to assemble 249
3. The faubourgs assemble 251

Digitized by Google

4. The assembly meets.—Noon 259
a. Roederer reports the situation 260
1′. Urges action 260
5. The procession is at the door 264
E. The procession 265
1. Outside the assembly hall 267
a. Plants liberty tree 272
b. Municipal officers try to keep order 273
c. Gate of garden of Tuileries forced 274
2. The petitioners enter the hall 275
a. Saint-Huguin reads a petition 275
3. The citizens march through the hall 280
4. The Carrousel invaded 284
a. The crowd confused but peaceable 286
5. The royal gate is forced 289
a. The crowd enters the chateau 290
6. The Tuileries invaded 291
a. The king in presence of the people 295
1′. Puts on liberty cap 297
2′. Tries to speak 297
b. Cries—"Recall the ministers", "Sanction the decrees" 299
c. Deputations from assembly enter 301
d. The mayor intervenes 308
1′. Clears the apartments 313
e. The queen's apartment invaded 316
1′. She joins the king 316
f. The crowd passes out 319
1′. The chateau is silent 320
F. The meeting of the assembly 321
1. Reports of the invasion 321
VI. Conclusion 324

I

Introduction

Viewed not simply as an incident in the history of the legislative assembly but regarded in the light of the larger movement of the revolution, the uprising of the 20th of June, 1792, becomes one of the turning points in the long struggle of an arbitrary monarch against the attempt of the French people to establish and

Digitized by Google

maintain a constitution. The struggle began with the opening of the States-General in 1789, and ended with the suspension of the king on August 10, 1792.

During the early part of this struggle the French people looked upon Louis XVI as their *"bon roi,"* in sympathy with the movement for the regeneration of France. Although at first attributing his resistance to their proposed reforms, and his delay in approving them to the influence of his entourage, they gradually became convinced that both Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were playing a dishonest part. When it was fully recognized that the king and queen were unwilling to accept the constitution in good faith their overthrow became inevitable.[1]

Whatever the idea of the king and his ministry may have been in calling the States-General, there was a firm conviction in the minds of the French people that the main purpose of the assembly was to be the reformation of the government. This is evident from the *cahiers*.[2] A study of these documents makes clear that all classes—clergy, nobility, and the third estate—were insistent in the demand for a constitution. It was probably not the intention of the government that the people should interpret the letter of convocation[3] in this definite way, but considered in the light of the *Résultat du conseil* of December 27, 1788, such an interpretation does not seem to lack justification.[4]

To grasp fully the significance of the struggle, it must be understood that the third estate, representing the overwhelming majority of the French people, considered themselves instructed by their constituents to put an end to arbitrary power and to establish equality before the law. While the accomplishment of the latter end might bring them into conflict with the clergy and the nobility, there seemed to be no sufficient reason why they should not receive the support of the king. For centuries he had been regarded as

[1] Fling, "The Oath of the Tennis Court," 2, 3.

[2] Champion, *La France d'après les cahiers de 1789*, chap. III.

[3] Brette, *Recueil de documents relatifs à la convocation des états-généraux de 1789*, I, 64–66.

[4] *Moniteur*, Introduction, 509; Aulard, *Etudes et leçons, 4 série* (1893), 41–51.

Digitized by Google

the adversary of the privileged orders and it was but natural that the third estate should look to him for leadership in this crisis. Consequently they expected on his part at least a policy of non-resistance to their efforts.

But in this expectation they were disappointed. If in the discussion of the verification of credentials at the opening of the States-General, the king did not at first declare himself in favor of either party, it was possible for the third estate to interpret his action in a manner favorable to their cause. But when, under the stress of circumstances, the third estate declared itself national assembly, the king abandoned his neutral policy, attempted to undo the work of the third estate and threw his protection over the privileged classes. This reactionary policy at length brought the king into conflict with the representatives of the majority of the French people.[5]

That the struggle was one for supremacy between the old conception of "divine right" and the new conception of the sovereignty of the people became clear on the 20th of June, 1789. Under pretext of preparing the hall of the third estate for the meeting of the royal session, called for June 22, the doors were closed to the deputies on the 20th. Moved by the fear that the government intended to dissolve the assembly, the commons took the famous oath of the tennis court in which they proclaimed that no one had the right to suspend their sessions. The resolution affirmed that nothing could prevent the assembly "from continuing its deliberations in whatsoever place it might establish itself." "At that moment, the assembly asserted its supremacy over the royal authority, virtually declaring itself supreme in the state."[6]

Ignoring this declaration, the king persisted in his reactionary policy and on June 23 held the royal session. Here he annulled the previous decrees of the assembly and promised a series of reforms including most of the demands of the *cahiers,* but he made no satisfactory concessions concerning the organization and periodical meetings of the States-General, thus making the fulfil-

[5] Christophelsmeier, "The First Revolutionary Step."
[6] Fling, "The Oath of the Tennis Court," 7, 8.

Digitized by Google

ment of his promises depend upon his own good will. Undismayed by the display of force made by the government, the commons disobeyed the king's orders to separate, persisted in their previous decrees, and protected their members by a declaration of inviolability. Being impressed by the sturdy attitude of the commons and influenced by the public agitation in Paris and Versailles, the king, unwilling at this time to use force, brought about the union of the three orders on June 27.

But this act in no sense marked the reconciliation of the king with the new order of things. His attitude became more aggressive and the appeal to force, not made on the 23d of June, was attempted the second week in July, when the uprising of Paris and the fall of the Bastille forced the king to withdraw the troops from Paris and Versailles and to recognize the supremacy of the assembly.[7]

Having failed in this appeal to force, the resistance to the new order of things on the part of the king now assumed a more passive form. The new policy was shown in his attitude toward such acts of the assembly as required his sanction to give them the force of law. He delayed the promulgation of the 4th of August decrees, making them public only under the most extreme pressure from the assembly. He followed the same policy of procrastination in accepting the declaration of rights and the articles of the constitution, declining to approve them unless the executive power were left absolutely in the hands of the monarch.[8]

The calling of the regiment of Flanders was looked upon by the people of Paris as an attempt on the part of the king to maintain his position in opposition to all influence that might be brought to bear by the populace of Paris. It was even thought that the regiment was to be used to cover his flight, if that became necessary. The banquet of the bodyguard at Versailles served to strengthen this belief and led to the uprising of October 5.

[7] Caron, "La tentative de contre-révolution de juin-juillet 1789," in *Revue d'histoire moderne,* VIII, 5–34, 649–78; Flammermont, *Le 14 juillet 1789.*

[8] Stoddard, "The Causes of the Insurrection of the 5th and 6th of October," 23–25.

Digitized by Google

One aim at least of this movement was to bring the king to Paris and so withdraw him from the influence of both the court party and the moderates in the assembly.[9] This plan having been successfully carried out, again it was believed that the king's resistance to the revolution would cease.

But his change of residence did not effect a change of the king's purpose and his resistance only sought a new channel. Neither open force nor passive resistance had been able to prevent the abolition of privilege, the promulgation of a declaration of rights, nor the establishment of the bases of a constitution. To his policy of bad faith, to which he still adhered, the king now added a new policy of foreign intervention. He appealed to the powers of Europe to aid him in his attempt to render futile the efforts of the French people to establish a constitution.[10] Marie Antoinette was in constant communication with the Emperor Leopold and was even more bitter than the king against the revolution. She had no intention of abiding by the constitution and it was understood that her influence controlled the court.[11] So far did the king carry this double-dealing as to accept publicly the constitution which he was secretly plotting to destroy. In the speech delivered before the assembly, February 4, 1790, he proclaimed his attachment to the new order of things, promised to defend and maintain the constitution, and to train the dauphin to follow in his footsteps as a constitutional ruler.[12] It was this long course of dissimulation and international intrigue, entered upon both by Louis and his queen, that led to their ruin.[13]

The attempted flight of the royal family June 21, 1791, rendered certain what up to that time had been a matter of suspicion. The duplicity of the king was laid bare before the eyes of all France.

[9] Stoddard, "The Causes of the Insurrection of the 5th and 6th of October," 38–47.

[10] *Cambridge Modern History,* VIII, 215; Flammermont, *Nègociations secrètes,* 5–9.

[11] Sorel, *L'Europe et la révolution française,* II, 436; Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* Chap. II, also 90, 190.

[12] *Moniteur,* III, 297.

[13] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* 24–27.

Digitized by Google

It was made clear beyond doubt by the document left behind him in which he justified his acts and confessed that he had never accepted the revolution in good faith.[14] In the face of such a confession the assembly persisted in its efforts to reconcile the king to the new order of things. Arrested and brought back to Paris, he was suspended from power and placed under guard until the constitution was finished. Then set at liberty, he was permitted to accept or reject the constitution. Again he perjured himself. Having publicly accepted the new constitution he at once entered into secret negotiations with the king of Prussia for an armed congress of the powers to help him reestablish a more desirable order of things in France.[15]

There followed then under the legislative assembly, a period of pretense of administering the government under the new constitution during which time the king, though acting within constitutional limits, was wholly out of sympathy with the new state of things.[16]

The armed congress had long been the idea of Marie Antoinette and her agents at Brussels had numerous allies in the French army.[17] The Emperor Leopold had decided as early as January, 1792, upon armed intervention.[18] This attitude of Austria aggravated the situation.[19] Its presumptuous interference in the in-

[14] Glagau, *Die französische Legislative,* 1–3; *Histoire parlementaire,* X, 269–74; Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* chap. III.

[15] *Moniteur,* IX, 152, 655; Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* chap. V; Flammermont, *Négociations secrètes,* 9, Louis XVI to the King of Prussia, Dec. 3, 1791; Klinckowström, *Le comte de Fersen et la cour de France,* II, 193, Fersen to Gustavus III, March 4, 1792.

[16] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* chap. VI.

[17] Klinckowström, *Le comte de Fersen et la cour de France,* I, 233 ff. Letters of Marie Antionette to Fersen, October and November, 1791. Arneth, *Maria-Antoinette, Joseph II und Leopold II,* 259, Mercy to Kaunitz, April 8, 1792.

[18] Flammermont, *Négociations secrètes,* 16, Schulembourg to Bréteuil, Feb. 13, 1792; Vivenot, *Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserpolitik Oesterreichs,* I, 327–70.

[19] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* chap. VII; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 4; Arneth, *Maria-Antoinette, Joseph II und Leopold II,* 253, Mercy to Marie Antoinette, March, 1792.

Digitized by Google

ternal affairs of France[20] and the weak policy of the existing ministry, led the assembly to force a Girondist ministry upon the king, March 12, 1792. The following month, April 20, the assembly, on the proposition of the king acting on the advice of the new ministry, declared war against Austria.[21] The responsibility of this war, however, can not be charged to the new ministry but to Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, the king of Prussia and the king of Hungary.[22] The king gladly accepted the situation as it offered him a possible means of coöperation with foreign states and would thus enable him to realize his plan of dictating to France under the protection of foreign armies. He continued his secret negotiations with Prussia and Austria and had no serious intention of repelling the Prussian invasion while Marie Antoinette even counted the days that must pass before the arrival of the enemy in Paris.[23]

The situation was a most serious one for France. The treason of the king was suspected by the assembly and it was realized that the country and the constitution must be saved in spite of him. Vigorous measures were necessary and the Girondins introduced them into the assembly. The increasing disorder in the provinces, instigated by the priests who had not taken the oath to the constitution, led to the passage of a decree against the nonjuring clergy, May 27, 1792. The continued suspicion as to the king's good faith in the defensive operations of the war and the

[20] Vivenot, *Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserpolitik Oesterreichs,* I, 433; Klinckowström, *Le comte de Fersen et la cour de France,* II, 226, Dispatch of Caraman to Bréteuil, April 10, 1792.

[21] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* chap. VIII, IX.

[22] Flammermont, *Négociations secrètes,* 23, 28, 30; Mellié, *Les sections de Paris pendant la révolution française,* 104.

[23] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* chap. X; Aulard, *Histoire politique de la révolution française,* 185; Sorel, *L'Europe et la révolution française,* II, 436; Klinckowström, *Le comte de Fersen et la cour de France,* II, 242, Fersen to Marie Antoinette, April 24, 1792; 286, Fersen to Marie Antoinette, June 2, 1792; 298, Fersen to Marie Antoinette, June 11, 1792; 318, Marie Antoinette to Fersen, July 6, 1792; Arneth, *Marie Antoinette, Joseph II und Leopold II,* 266, Mercy to the Queen, July 9, 1792; Flammermont, *Négociations secrètes,* 29–30, Bréteuil to Schulembourg July 4, 1792 and July 14, 1792.

Digitized by Google

fear of his body guard, which was hostile to the assembly, led to the decrees for the dismissal of the body guard, May 29, 1792, and for the formation of the camp of *fédérés,* June 8.[24] The purpose of the latter decree was to intimidate the king and to protect the assembly.

While the king hesitated to accept these decrees, Roland presented him a letter urging him to sign them. The king's determination to veto them led to the dismissal of the Girondist ministry, June 12.[25]

This action precipitated a crisis. When the king vetoed the decree against the clergy and that providing for the camp of *fédérés,* he was acting within his constitutional rights, but the assembly believed he was using this technical right to deliver France into the hands of her enemies. The French people, then, must either submit to the indignity of being delivered over to Austria and Prussia and suffer the loss of constitutional government, or violate the very constitution that they had created.

The uprising of June 20 was the last peaceful attempt made by the people of Paris to induce the king to abandon his policy of duplicity and to govern in sympathy with the revolution, in accordance with the wishes of the assembly, to defend France against foreign invasion and to save the constitution. They hoped to induce him to withdraw his veto and recall the Girondist ministers, but the plan failed.[26] The people's answer was the 10th of August and the suspension of the king.[27] Examined thus in its connection with the revolution as a whole, the action of the people of Paris on June 20 becomes intelligible and its profound significance stands revealed.

[24] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 5; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 4.
[25] Madame Roland, *Mémoires,* I, 450; Aulard in *Révolution française,* XXXV, 525; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 5.
[26] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* 212.
[27] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 7.

Digitized by Google

II

The Decrees of the Assembly

In the spring of 1792, the ministry of Louis XVI was divided. The minority, supported by the Feuillants, led by the Lameths and by the minority of the assembly, were opposed to war with Austria and were secretly plotting a reconstruction of the constitution in the interest of the monarch and the aristocracy.[1] In this work they counted on the support of Austria. The Girondist majority in the assembly compelled the retirement of the ministry representing this policy and on March 12, a new ministry, in sympathy with the dominant party in the assembly, was forced upon the king.[2] This Girondist ministry stood for the vigorous prosecution of the war, for the maintenance of constitutional government, and for the restoration of order in France.[3] It was not, however, a harmonious ministry, Dumouriez being the disturbing element. He was at variance with his colleagues, selfishly ambitious, and suspected of far-reaching designs.[4]

In the effort to carry out its policy, the new ministry naturally found itself in opposition to the king who by the use of his constitutional veto was endeavoring to control the situation until the allies should reach Paris. The clash came as the result of the assembly's decrees concerning the clergy, the king's guard and

[1] Mercy states that the party of the Lameths and Duport wished to establish two chambers similar to the English form of government but that the queen objected to this arrangement. She engaged him to present her objections to the Abbé Louis who had been employed by the Lameths to influence her through Mercy. Glagau, *Die französische Legislative,* 320, Mercy to Kaunitz, Brussels, May 30, 1792.

[2] The members of this ministry were Roland, minister of interior, Servan, minister of war, Clavière, minister of finance. Duranthon, Lacoste and Dumouriez were the other members, but the first three named were regarded as representatives of the Girondist majority.

[3] Sorel, *L'Europe et la révolution française,* II, 299–403; Von Sybel, *History of the French Revolution,* I, 405–70.

[4] *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 522; *Mémoires de Madame Roland,* I, 395 ff; Oelsner in *Revue Historique,* LXXXIII, 308.

Digitized by Google

the camp of 20,000 *fédérés* near Paris, all of which were looked upon by the assembly as necessary measures.

The decree against the priests was considered essential to the suppression of civil war; the dissolution of the king's guard was regarded as imperative because of its lack of loyalty to the assembly and its well-known devotion to the king who, it was feared, might use it for his own ends; the camp of 20,000 *fédérés* was decreed for the purpose of protecting the assembly and guarding Paris.[5] The king naturally wanted no such protection. Louis permitted the dissolution of his body guard, but his conscience forbade him to sanction the decree against the priests and his good common sense led him to veto the decree for the camp.[6]

The action of the assembly had to a large extent been due to the pressure of public sentiment. There was great agitation in the Jacobin club where these questions were freely discussed and criticized.[7] The populace of Paris was in a state of violent excitement and at the first decisive news of the war might go to any extremity.[8] Indignation against the queen was very pronounced and the pretext for an attack upon her was found in Brissot's attempt to show the existence of an "Austrian committee" of which she was said to be the head.[9] The court party, frightened at the sentiment against it, strove to fix upon the Orleanist party the responsibility for the origin of the report of the existence of a so-called "Austrian committee."[10] In this state of affairs there was nothing for the assembly to do but to take vigorous action for the restoration of order.

[5] Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 4; *L'indicateur* says (XXXII, June 20, 1792), in regard to the decree for an armed camp that it was a legal method for bringing armed men from the south to Paris, thus establishing a dictatorship of the departments. The *Indicateur* was hostile to the Girondists.

[6] Sorel, *L'Europe et la révolution française,* II, 479.

[7] Aulard, *La société des Jacobins,* III, 599–697; IV, 2–23.

[8] Bacourt, *Correspondance entre le comte de Mirabeau et le comte de La Marck,* III, 305–08.

[9] Glagau, *Die französische Legislative,* 321, Pellenc to La Marck, end of May, 1792; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 329; *L'indicateur,* XXXII, June 20, 1792.

[10] *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 432, 467.

Digitized by Google

Looking toward this end the assembly had passed the series of decrees already mentioned, the first of which was directed against the priests who had refused the oath to the civil constitution. Religious disturbances necessitated some decisive action against them for it would have been incompatible with the preservation of the state to treat longer as members of society those who were evidently seeking to dissolve it.[11] To consent to the project of assembling the non-juring priests in the chief places of the departments would have been equal to creating eighty-three centers of discord, fanaticism, and counter-revolution. The country must be purged. Such was the feeling of the majority of the assembly.[12]

After a discussion of several days, the assembly, actuated by the fear of the overthrow of the constitution, passed the following decree, May 27, 1792:[13] "When twenty active citizens of a canton shall demand that a non-juring priest leave the realm, the directory of the department must pronounce his deportation, if the opinion of the directory conforms to the petition. If the opinion of the directory does not conform to the demand of the twenty citizens, it shall determine through committees whether the presence of the priest is a menace to public peace, and if the opinion of the committee conforms to the demand of the twenty petitioners, the deportation shall be ordered."[14] This decree placed the clergy between the oath and deportation, but while they trembled at the assembly's project many still refused to take the oath.[15]

This measure was followed by another directed against the king's bodyguard. The guard had allowed anti-revolutionary sentiments to escape it and had uttered menaces against the

[11] *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 390; Louis Blanc, *Histoire de la révolution française,* VIII, 17; *Mémoires de Madame Roland,* I, 386; Carro, *Santerre,* 106.

[12] *Correspondance de Thomas Lindet,* 348–50; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 4.

[13] Morris, *Diary and Letters,* II, 535.

[14] *Moniteur,* XII, 483, 560.

[15] *Révolution de Paris,* XII, 390; *Correspondance de Thomas Lindet,* 347–53.

Digitized by Google

assembly.[16] It was believed to be royalist in its sympathies and wholly devoted to the person of the king, pervaded with the spirit of incivism and wholly lacking in *esprit de corps*. On May 28, Bazire proposed its dissolution, charging orgies of its officers and a plan for carrying away the king and asked that he be allowed to give his proofs the following day.[17] Chabot declared on the same day that he had one hundred and eighty-two documents which proved the existence of a plot to dissolve the assembly.[18] Following a report of a counterplot, set for May 27, the assembly decreed that its sessions should be permanent, that the Paris guard should be doubled, and that Pétion should be required to report upon the state of the capital daily.[19]

At nine o'clock on the morning of May 29, Pétion reported that the night had been calm and nothing announced a disturbance. He had scarcely finished his report when with a great uproar, a crowd from the section of the Gobelins demanded admission to the hall. Armed with pikes, guns, and forks, dressed in sans-culottes and red caps, and preceded by grenadiers, they crossed the hall with drums beating and ranged themselves around the assembly, swearing to sacrifice themselves to defend it.[20]

Bazire thereupon presented his report for the dissolution of the king's guard. He pointed out that the greatest irregularities existed in its organization, that a large number of its members were ineligible, its ranks being filled with youths, priests, men from Coblentz, and some former Swiss guards. He showed that these defenders of the chateau were possessed by a spirit of counter-revolution which might overturn the actual régime. He charged orgies of officers in which the troopers had joined in drinking the health of the king, the queen and the prince.

[16] Oelsner in *Revue historique*, LXXXIII, 305.

[17] *Moniteur*, XII, 508.

[18] *Moniteur*, XII, 513; *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 418.

[19] *Histoire parlementaire*, XIV, 297 ff.

[20] *Moniteur*, XII, 508; *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 378; Lindet, *Correspondance*, IV. The assembly held an uninterrupted session May 28, 29, 30, 31, indicating the critical state of public affairs.

Digitized by Google

Couthon spoke of a conspiracy with the Tuileries at its head. Scenes in the barracks were depicted in which white flags had been found together with royalist songs and pamphlets attacking the assembly. White cockades had been distributed among the Swiss, libels on representatives of the people had been mysteriously thrown about, and the cry, "To the devil with the nation," was heard in the court of the Tuileries. The most extraordinary excitement prevailed in the assembly and this was increased by the insolence of the royalist members.[21]

Public suspicion was strong against the king. It was felt that he was in secret correspondence with his brothers, that he was protecting the *emigrés* and that he was surrounded by enemies of the country. To dissolve the guard might baffle a plot and paralyze the work of the "Austrian committee."[22]

The arguments were finally summed up by Gaudet who stated three reasons why the guard should be dissolved: first, it was illegally organized; second, its chiefs sought to inspire revolt; third, the majority favored a counter-revolution. The assembly decreed, May 29, 1792, that the guard should be dissolved and its commandant, the Duc de Brissac, put under arrest.[23] This decree was executed at once.[24]

After his ministers had showed him the danger and the uselessness of resistance, Louis XVI signed unwillingly on May 31, the decree against his guard. He, however, assured the guard of his affection for them and his satisfaction at their service and

---

[21] *Moniteur,* XII, 513–16; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 420; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 5.

[22] *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 382; Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXIII, 306.

[23] *Moniteur,* XII, 526–29.

[24] Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXIII, 306; It was shown that an order had been given to the guard by Sombreuil, governor of the Hôtel des Invalides, to allow all men who presented themselves armed from the king's guard or the king's household to enter the hotel during the night. This seemed to indicate that the Hôtel des Invalides had been chosen as a meeting place for all malcontents. Sombreuil, summoned before the assembly May 29, admitted the charge, but explained nothing. *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 382, 419, 420.

Digitized by Google

manifested the greatest sympathy for the Duc de Brissac when that officer took leave of him to go to Orleans.[25]

On the morning of May 30, Pétion again reported the situation in Paris as tranquil.[26] At the evening session, Louvet asked that all the sections of Paris be declared permanent, saying "It is necessary to take wise precautions that we may not one day be reduced to the frightful necessity of causing the blood of rebels to flow in the streets."[27] On May 31, Pétion reported that tranquility was perfectly established in Paris and in the evening the assembly closed its permanent session.[28]

Such was the situation when the assembly passed its third decree. This provided for a camp of 20,000 *fédérés,* to be assembled on June 14 near Paris. The proposition was made to the assembly June 4 by Servan, without previous consultation, it is said, either with his colleagues or with the king.[29] Servan urged in his proposition that the act was necessary to establish tranquillity in the country. The decree itself states that its purpose is to draw more closely the bonds of fraternity between the departments of France. The discussions in the assembly showed that the object of that body was to insure public security. The allies were approaching from without and enemies of the constitution were plotting from within. Paris and the assembly must have protection.[30]

[25] *Mémoires de Ferrières,* III, 76; *Mémoires de Madame Campan,* II, 202, 204; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 430, letter of D'Hervilly, a former commandant of the king's guard; Chaumette in his *Mémoires* (5) states that the king issued a proclamation the next day calumniating the assembly and praising the zealous partisans in the guard, but Aulard in a note says he was not able to find this proclamation.

[26] *Moniteur,* XII, 531.

[27] *Moniteur,* XII, 536; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 421.

[28] *Moniteur,* XII, 536; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 421, 424; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 246, p. 493.

[29] *Moniteur,* XII, 570; *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 267; Pétion in an article entitled, *Avis à mes concitoyens,* published in *Annales patriotiques* June 20, 1792, says that although he and Servan were closely associated at this time, Servan had not communicated his project to him.

[30] *Moniteur,* XII, 570–96; Blanc-Gilli (*Lettre d'un député de l'assemblée*

Digitized by Google

Servan's proposition was put in the form of a motion by Merlin, and after a discussion of two days it was passed, June 6.[31] It provided in seven articles for the formation of a camp of 20,000 *fédérés,* recruited from all France in the ratio of five men per canton, to be assembled near Paris, July 14, while all the troops of the line now in the capital should immediately be sent to the frontiers.[32]

On June 7, it was voted that the twenty thousand should be armed and equipped by the nation. Then followed a discussion upon the manner of choosing the required number of men, should the number enrolled exceed that allowed for each canton.[33] On June 8, it was decided by article seven that the choice should be made by the entire number enrolled, in the presence of the municipality.[34]

Servan's decree met with strong opposition. In the Jacobin club, Robespierre opposed it as useless and dangerous. He asked why the army was to be brought to Paris and not directed to the frontiers. He feared the enemies of equality would become masters of the capital. He believed, too, that article seven would become a source of trouble, that it would prove ruinous to the Girondins.[35] Dumouriez violently reproached Servan in the council meeting for not having presented the decree to the council

nationale au département des Bouches-du-Rhône) writing to his constituents, June 21, 1792, asserted that Servan's proposition was meant to stir up the people; that it was not his own invention but was suggested to him by republican conspirators; that only on this supposition could one explain the letters written from Paris to Toulon and Marseilles early in May announcing the coming federation and asking the people to prepare their arms. Then he added that all this indicated a plan to massacre a number of functionaries of the nation and the royal family.

[31] *Moniteur,* XII, 571, 592.

[33] *Ibid.,* XII, 607, gives the final wording of the decree; Mortimer-Ternaux, *Histoire de la Terreur,* I, 115; Louis Blanc, *Histoire de la révolution française,* VIII, 26.

[33] *Moniteur,* XII, 604.

[34] *Ibid.,* XII, 607.

[35] Aulard, *La société des Jacobins,* III, 668.

Digitized by Google

first and but for the presence of the king the altercation between these two ministers might have led to blows.[36]

Robespierre and Dumouriez were not alone in their opposition to the measure. It was also opposed by the party of the Feuillants.[37] Their leaders prepared a reactionary petition with 8,000 signatures, drawn largely from the members of the national guards. In this body there was much agitation because of Servan's speech, some of his expressions proving offensive to the Constitutionals. They seemed to question the loyalty of the national guard.[38]

On the 8th and 9th of June, deputations from several batallions complained to the assembly of this attack and presented a petition, requesting the withdrawal of the decree and protesting their devotion to liberty and the fatherland.[39] For several sessions the assembly listened to accusations from partisans of the petition and from those who denounced it. The Mountain here deftly changed the ground of attack from the decree to the petition which had been circulated in the battalions for the purpose of extorting signatures. A letter asking for signatures, sent by the staff of the national guard to each battalion, was read to the assembly.[40] It was charged that women also had been forced to sign the petition for their husbands.[41] On June 11, a number of persons appeared before the assembly to withdraw their signatures and among them an officer of the national guard.[42]

Finally, on June 10, the assembly expelled from the hall as calumniators all petitioners who had expressed indignation either

[36] *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 268, 269; Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXIII, 308; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 480. This contemporary newspaper claims that Dumouriez, two months before, advocated just such a camp to save Paris.

[37] Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXIII, 308.

[38] Mortimer-Ternaux points out (*Histoire de la terreur,* I, 115) that the *Moniteur* does not give Servan's speech in full, but suppresses the irritating phrases which were criticised in the petition which the national guard presented to the assembly.

[39] *Moniteur,* XII, 605, 618, 622; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 5.

[40] *Moniteur,* XII, 618.

[41] *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 482.

[42] *Ibid.,* XII, 509, 510; *Moniteur,* XII, 634–36, 638–40.

Digitized by Google

at the decree of the assembly or at the insinuations made against the national guard by the minister of war. They declared by another decree that the assembly could not listen to petitions which were the result of criminal intrigue. The Right, indignant at this decision, retired from the hall and when the president accorded the petitioners the honors of the session, the Left by a motion of adjournment disposed of the petitioners and of the question which they had forced upon the assembly.[48]

III

The Fall of the Girondist Ministry

By the middle of June, the feeling of unrest, discontent, and fear had become general and pronounced. There was danger, it was believed, from the so-called Austrian faction, the Prussian army was approaching, treason existed everywhere and grain was getting dearer.[1]

Anarchy actually reigned. Would the assembly fill Paris with an army of national guards? Partisans and adversaries of the camp of *fédérés* were continually on the point of coming to blows. A street orator came into the garden of the Tuileries to read a libel, preach the assassination of the king and foretell his overthrow.[2] Marat, although he had been condemned, continued

[48] Ternaux, *Histoire de la terreur,* I, 116; *Moniteur,* XII, 635. The *Moniteur* here states that the Left was the first to retire, but this is apparently a misstatement, as it was the Left that carried the measure against the petitioners.

[1] Lindet, *Correspondance,* 336; Lescure, *Correspondance secrète,* 601–03, *Lettre* 20, Paris, 16 juin, 1792; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 3.

[2] June 12, Delfaux, a member of the Right, denounced to the assembly a libel that an orator had read to a crowd in the garden of the Tuileries. Referring to Louis XVI, he said: "But this monster uses his power and his treasure to oppose the regeneration of the French. A new Charles IX, he wishes to bring upon France desolation and death. Go, cruel one, your crimes will have an end. Damiens was less culpable than you. He was punished with more horrible tortures for having wished to deliver France from a monster. And you, whose attempt is twenty-five million times greater, go unpunished. But tremble, tyrants, there is a Scaevola among us." *Moniteur,* XII, 642.

Digitized by Google

to write from his hiding place and filled his journal with invectives and threats of vengeance against those whom he accused of uniting with the court.[3] In the Jacobin club, there were heated discussions upon the insolence of the Austrians, the dissolution of the guard, the suspected generals, and the traitorous priests.[4] In the council there were stormy scenes between Dumouriez and the three Girondist ministers, Roland, Servan, and Clavière.[5]

The public was impatiently awaiting the sanction of the decrees and the king's delay but confirmed the suspicions that were abroad concerning his bad faith. The decree against the priests had been in his hands since June 2 and its sanction was awaited even more impatiently than the sanction of the others.[6] The restlessness was increased by an event of June 3, the procession of the *Fête-dieu,* on which occasion there had been much disorder caused by acts of violence and by insults addressed to officers by priests.[7] The newspapers by their reports and comments increased this unrest and the people of the faubourgs were becoming ever more irritated and threatened an uprising.[8]

While Paris was thus full of disorders and scandals, Dumouriez urged the king to sanction the decrees, assuring him that without the aid of force he could not hope to override the suspicions of the greater part of the nation, nor the rage of the Jacobins, nor the politics of the republican party.[9] But the king asked for time to reflect.

This state of affairs could not last. Someone must act. The

[3] Ternaux, I, 118.

[4] Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* III, 590–697; Lescure, *Correspondance secrète,* 601–03, *lettre* 20.

[5] *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 269–71; *Mémoires de Madame Roland,* I, 386.

[6] *Moniteur,* XII, 560.

[7] *Histoire parlementaire,* XIV, 424, contains the text of the municipal decree of June 1 against this procession; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 492–94, gives a description of the procession.

[8] *Histoire parlementaire,* XIV, 425, gives extracts from Brissot's *Patriote français,* June 4, and from *Le tribune des patriotes,* No. III, of Camille Desmoulins.

[9] *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 269–73; Lescure, *Correspondance secrète, lettre* 20.

Digitized by Google

ministry decided to force the hand of the king or to expose his treachery to the eyes of France. Roland took the initiative, making the delay in signing the decrees the occasion of a letter to the king—a letter famous in the history of the revolution. It has been aptly termed "the ultimatum of the Girondins to royalty."[10] In this step he had the support of two of his colleagues, Servan and Clavière.[11] The letter was dated June 10 and undoubtedly reflected the state of feeling of the majority of the French people.

Roland stated that the enthusiasm for the constitution was so strong that the people were ready to die in its support;[12] he assured the king that the effect of his attitude would be to encourage his enemies and arouse defiance;[13] he showed that fermentation was extreme throughout France and that the inflamed minds might be aroused to commit terrible deeds;[14] he added, furthermore, that the revolution was sure to be accomplished and that the king's action only caused suspicion and would result in the overthrow of the throne;[15] and concluded with the assurance

[10] *Ternaux,* I, 119.

[11] Madame Roland states (*Mémoires,* I, 387) that all the ministers approved the idea of this letter to the king, but showed weakness when it came time to act. There is no other evidence to show that Dumouriez, Duranthon or Lacoste approved it.

[12] "Les Français se sont donné une constitution; elle a fait des mécontens et des rebelles; la majorité de la nation la veut maintenir; elle a juré de la défendre au prix de son sang. . . . La déclaration des droits est devenue un évangile politique; et la constitution française, une religion pour laquelle le peuple est prêt à périr. . . . La révolution est faite dans les esprits: elle s'achevera au prix du sang et sera cimentée par lui." *Moniteur,* XII, 658.

[13] "Ces sentiments, qul tiennent à la nature du cœur humain, ont dû entrer dans le calcul des ennemis de la révolution. Ils ont donc compté sur une faveur secrète, jusqu'à ce que les circonstances permissent une protection declarée. Ces dispositions ne pouvaient échapper à la nation elle-même, et elles ont dû la tenir en défiance." *Moniteur,* XII, 658.

[14] "La fermentation est extrême dans toutes les parties de l'empire; elle éclatera d'une manière terrible." *Moniteur,* XII, 658.

[15] "Le salut de l'état et le bonheur de Votre Majesté sont intimement liés; aucune puissance n'est capable de les séparer; de cruelles angoisses et des

Digitized by Google

that the remedy for the situation was to be found in the king's support of the assembly and the constitution and in his sanction of the decrees.[16]

Just how this letter was communicated to the king is not known. According to Dumouriez, it was read in the council meeting June 10, but according to Madame Roland it was sent to the king June 11. Dumouriez accused Roland of bad faith respecting this letter, asserting that he promised the king that the letter should remain a secret between them and then read it to the council and sent it to the assembly.[17] His statement is not convincing.

The feeling at the court was very bitter. The king was indignant at what he considered an insult. On the following morning Dumouriez, who was now at the height of royal favor, was called to the chateau.[18] He found the king and queen together. The

malheurs certains environneront votre trône, s'il n'est appuyé par vous-même sur les bases de la constitution." *Ibid.*

[16] "Le retard de leur sanction inspire des défiances: s'il est prolongé, il causera des mécontens. . . . que votre Majesté lui donne sa sanction! la tranquillité publique la réclame. Pourquoi faut-il que des retards lui donnent l'air du regret, lorsque la célérité lui gagnerait tous les coeurs! . . . déjà l'opinion compromet les intentions de Votre Majesté." *Ibid.;* "Il est évident pour la nation française que sa constitution peut marcher; que le gouvernment aura toute la force qui lui est necessaire, du moment où Votre Majesté, voulant absolument le triomphe de cette constitution, soutiendra le corps législatif de toute la puissance de l'execution, ôtera tout prétexte aux inquiétudes du peuple, et tout espoir aux mécontens." *Ibid.;* See the letter in full, *Moniteur,* XII, 658. This letter was written by Madame Roland, though she and Roland had agreed on the groundwork of it. *Mémoires de Madame Roland,* I, 387, Roederer (*Chronique de cinquante jours,* 8) refers to it as written by Roland, but he wrote thirty years after and we do not know his authority.

[17] Dumouriz says the letter began, "Sire, cette lettre-ci restera éternellement ensevelie entre vous et moi." Neither this nor any similar passage is found in the letter as published in the *Mémoires* of Madame Roland nor in the *Moniteur.* It is difficult to say whether Roland cut out from his letter the expression that would have inconvenienced him or whether Dumouriez reported what would have aggravated Roland's mistakes. *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 274. *Moniteur,* XII, 658.

[18] Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXIII, 308.

Digitized by Google

queen, he tells us, broke in with, "Do you think that the king ought to endure longer the menaces and insolence of Roland and the deceit of Servan and Clavière?" Dumouriez assured her that he did not think so and that he wondered at the patience of the king. He advised an entire change of ministers. The king thereupon expressed a wish that Dumouriez, Lacoste, and Duranthon remain. Dumouriez agreed only on condition that the king would sanction the decrees and this condition he asserts the king accepted.[19]

The fall of the Girondist ministry followed close upon the publication of the letter. Servan was dismissed on June 12, and Roland and Clavière on the following day. On June 13, these three men appeared in the assembly. A letter was read from Servan announcing his dismissal and stating the reasons. The assembly voted, amidst great applause, that he carried with him the esteem and regrets of the nation and that his letter should be printed and copies sent to the eighty-three departments. Thereupon a letter from the king announcing the dismissal of the ministers was read as well as letters from Roland and Clavière announcing their dismissal. The climax was reached with the reading of Roland's letter to the king. It made a profound impression upon the assembly, being interrupted by frequent applause and was received with marked approbation. The printing of the letter was decreed and it was voted to send copies to the eighty-three departments. The regrets of the nation were voted to Roland and after some objection to Clavière.[20]

The situation now grew clearer. This letter with all its attending circumstances, followed by the dismissal of the ministry, made it plain to all France that the king was holding firmly to his policy of determined opposition to the constitution. The action of the assembly proved just as clearly, that the sympathy

[19] *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 275–79. Royalist writers doubt whether the king ever agreed to sanction the decree against the priests. See Ternaux, I, 120; Morris, *Diary and Letters,* I, 544.

[20] *Moniteur,* XII, 656–59; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 516; *Mémoires de Dumouriez,* II, 290–91; Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXIII, 310; Lescure, *Correspondance secrète,* 601–03, *lettre* 20.

Digitized by Google

of the representatives of the nation was with the dismissed ministry, and the sending of Roland's letter to the eighty-three departments was nothing else than an appeal to the nation.[21]

The names of the men who were to replace the fallen ministers were announced to the assembly on June 13 in a letter from the king.[22] Dumouriez was leader of this ministry.[23]

On the same day that the dismissal of the Girondist ministry was made public, Dumouriez, as minister of war, read a *mémoire* in the assembly, upon the department of war, in which he criticized his predecessors, Degrave and Servan, complained of the deplorable state of the army and reported that several strong places were in a defenceless condition.[24] He was frequently interrupted by murmurs. The Left at once accused him of treason and threatened to send him to the high court of Orleans and decreed that he must lay before the assembly within twenty-four hours, documents in proof of his assertions. They reasoned that if his accusations were true, he was a criminal for having precipitated the country into war at such a time and if they were not true he was a calumniator.[25]

But the anger of the assembly was mild compared with that of the Jacobins and of the press. Dumouriez was unsparingly condemned by both.[26] Fearing an uprising, he again urged the king to sanction the decrees, but Louis continued to procrastinate, asking for a little more time, and so kept Dumouriez expecting his sanction.[27] Finally the king refused to sign and Dumouriez,

[21] Lescure, *Correspondance secrète*, 601–603, *lettre* 20.

[22] *Moniteur*, XII, 657; *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 516; *Mémories de Dumouriez*, II, 280–81.

[23] The other members of the new ministry were Mourgues, minister of interior and M. de Neuillac of foreign affairs. Duranthon and Lacoste remained and the ministry of finance was left vacant. King's letter, *Moniteur*, XII, 657; Chaumette, *Mémoires*, 6, note 2; Bacourt, *Correspondance entre le comte de Mirabeau et le comte de La Marck*, III, 311, Montmorin to La Marck, June 19, 1792.

[24] *Moniteur*, XII, 669 gives the complete *mémoire*.

[25] *Ibid.*, XII, 660.

[26] Aulard, *La société des Jacobins*, IV, 2–3; *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 522, ff.

[27] *Mémoires de Dumouriez*, II, 295.

Digitized by Google

realizing that it was useless to urge him further, resigned, three days after the Girondins had fallen. Much to his surprise—for he seems to have believed himself indispensable—his resignation was accepted.[28] His was a short and an inglorious ministry.

It was clear now that the king, who was a past-master in deception, had used Dumouriez only to get rid of Roland. But even this injustice brought little sympathy or regret for the fallen minister as he was generally regarded as an adventurer and an intriguer and it was even said that he was a traitor.[29]

IV

The Feuillant Ministry

The king, in a last effort to carry out his anti-revolutionary policy, chose a new ministry, the third in as many months. The letter announcing the appointment was read to the assembly on June 18, but these ministerial changes were so common that the assembly paid little heed to it. Of the old ministry Duranthon and Lacoste were retained, Chambonas was made minister of foreign affairs, Lajard of war, Terrier de Montciel of the interior, and Beaulieu of finance. The new ministry represented the Feuillant element in the assembly and was dominated by Lafayette.[1]

An event now occurred which stirred France to its depths and turned all eyes toward Lafayette.[2] That general brought himself effectually before the public by writing a threatening letter to the assembly, dated June 16, 1792, from his camp at Maubeuge. The letter has been called "the manifesto of the constitutional party as Roland's letter was of the Jacobins."[3] It was a most

[28] *Ibid.*, II, 295–300; Morris, *Diary and Letters*, I, 544, Morris to Jefferson, June 17, 1792.

[29] Oelsner in *Revue historique*, LXXXIII, 310; Lindet *Correspondance*, 356; Chaumette, *Mémoires*, 9.

[1] Chambonas was Lafayette's cousin and Lajard was one of his creatures. *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 522.

[2] *Nouvelle correspondance politique*, XII, 1.

[3] Ternaux, I, 128.

Digitized by Google

undiplomatic move and proved to be disastrous to the constitutional party. In this letter Lafayette attacked the Jacobin societies, as the authors of all disorders, and advised their suppression. He represented them as an empire having its metropolis and affiliations, as a distinct corporation in the midst of the French people of which it usurped the powers and subjugated the representatives. He denounced the ministry just fallen, especially Servan and Dumouriez, condemned the efforts then being made to overthrow the constitution and proclaimed his intention to enforce that instrument and so to carry out the supreme will of the people. Finally, he advised the assembly to suppress all foreign and internal enemies, asserting that France was able to protect herself, if she would.[4]

The letter was read in the assembly June 18 and was received with great applause. It was voted that it be printed and that copies be sent to the eighty-three departments. This entire approbation seemed to show that the assembly was Feuillant in its sympathies. The Left was greatly excited. Vergniaud made a vigorous speech in which he distinguished between petitions presented by simple citizens and those presented by the general of an army, asserting that the advice of a general to a legislative assembly amounted to dictation. Gaudet insisted that the letter could not have been written by Lafayette because it spoke of an event which occurred in Paris on June 16, and which could not have been known to Lafayette at Maubeuge on the same day.[5] The letter, he asserted, must have been fabricated or signed in blank. He then moved that it be sent to the committee of twelve and the motion was carried unanimously although this vote was entirely contradictory to the former vote of the assembly transmitting the letter to the departments.[6]

This letter caused the greatest excitement in Paris[7] spreading,

[4] *Moniteur,* XII, 698; *Histoire parlementaire,* XV, 69–74; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 10; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 3, 8.

[5] This event was the dismissal of Dumouriez as minister of war.

[6] *Moniteur,* XII, 692–93.

[7] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 16; *Mémoires du comte de Paroy,* 297; *Journal d'une bourgeoise,* 130, letter to her husband, June

Digitized by Google

of course, from the Jacobin club as the center of the most intense feeling. The death struggle had begun between this society and Lafayette.[8] He was denounced in their meeting of June 18, as being in league with the enemies of the country, as playing the rôle of a "new General Monk," and the demand was made that he be called before the bar of the assembly to answer for his acts and be sent to the high court of Orleans.[9]

But the feeling against Lafayette grew still more intense when he addressed another letter to the king in which he surpassed the dictatorial character displayed in the letter to the assembly. He advised the king to persist in his veto. "Maintain, Sire, the authority which the national will has delegated to you," are his words.[10] The newspapers accused him of treason and the assembly and clubs joined in the outcry.[11] A keen observer of his conduct declared that he must be either a rascal or an imbecile.[12]

Neither did Lafayette pass for being loyal to the cause of the king.[13] Early in May, he sent an agent to Mercy at Brussels to ascertain the situation in governmental affairs and to learn the king's wishes in regard to the constitution. He indicated that he and Rochambeau would use all their efforts to carry out the king's desires, saying they alone possessed the means of establishing royal authority. But Mercy distrusted him and ascribed to him one of three motives: (1) embarrassment attendant on the

19, 1792; *Correspondance entre le comte de Mirabeau et le comte de La Marck*, III, 311–19, Montmorin to La Marck, June 19, 1792.

[8] Glagau, *Die französische Legislative*, 342–60, Pellenc to La Marck, Paris, June 29, 1792; Pellenc to La Marck, Paris, June 30, 1792; Pellenc to La Marck, Paris, July 13–15, 1792; Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792*, 212.

[9] *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 537; Aulard, *La société des Jacobins*, IV, 10–16.

[10] See the letter in full in *Histoire parlementaire*, XV, 100, and in *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 535, and in Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 10.

[11] *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 535–37.

[12] Oelsner in *Revue historique*, LXXXIV, 71; Condorect in *Chroniques de Paris*, No. 172, 682; Paroy, *Mémoires*, 297.

[13] Glagau, *Die französische Legislative*, 341, Abbé Louis to Mercy, June 26, 1792.

Digitized by Google

disorganization of his army and the exhaustion of his resources; (2) the idea of escaping surveillance on the eve of a premeditated attack; or (3) a project of arousing distrust at the court of Berlin and of making dangerous use of responses which might be interpreted as overtures.[14] This distrust existed also at the Austrian court. Kaunitz, writing to Mercy concerning Lafayette's propositions, said emphatically that such a man did not deserve the least confidence. He advised Mercy, however, to use a Fabian policy in dealing with Lafayette but not to accept a single proposition of his as a basis for reëstablishing order in France.[15] Later correspondence between the two courts shows that this distrust was not dispelled. Fear was expressed that Lafayette would refuse to answer at the bar of the assembly to which he had been summoned and would find in the devotion of his army the means of resistance and so plunge the country into civil war.[16] His demand at the bar of the assembly for the punishment of the crimes of June 20 was also interpreted as an excuse for bringing on civil war.[17]

Circumstantial evidence seems to point to an understanding between Lafayette and the directory of the department of Paris.[18] The evidence also indicates that the fall of the Girondist ministry, as well as that of Dumouriez, was the result of a plot between Lafayette and the Feuillants.[19]

[14] *Ibid.*, 318, Mercy to Kaunitz, Brussels, May 16, 1792.

[15] Vivenot, *Deutsche Kaiserpolitik Oesterreichs*, II, 58, Kaunitz to Mercy, May 26, 1792.

[16] Glagau, *Die französische Legislative*, 339, *Mercy to Kaunitz*, June 27, 1792.

[17] *Ibid.*, 342–52, Pellenc to La Marck, June 29, 1792; Pellenc to La Marck, June 30, 1792.

[18] The letter was sent to the assembly on June 18, by a servant of the president of the directory. Moreover, the aristocratic newspapers had the contents of the letter on the morning of June 18. Who but the president of the directory could have given it to them? *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 532–33; *Histoire parlementaire*, XV, 101–02; Aulard, *La société des Jacobins*, IV, 15; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 67.

[19] *Histoire parlementaire*, XV, 74–78; Roederer relates an incident which indicates that Lafayette intrigued for the fall of the Girondist ministers. He had been sent to Lafayette's camp by Servan to assure that general

Digitized by Google

The official announcement of the king's veto was made on June 19. A letter from the minister of justice was read in the assembly stating that the king had vetoed, first the decree of May 27, regarding the deportation of priests; and second, that of June 8, regarding the increase of the armed force by 20,000 *fédérés* to be assembled near Paris, July 14.[20]

This public announcement was the occasion for offensive action. Discontent was general.[21] The storm was gathering. A civic banquet held on the Champs Elysées, June 19, and attended by many citizens was variously interpreted. Royalist newspapers reported it as an orgy attended by five hundred people where anarchists and deputies alike took part. They ascribed to it an evil purpose.[22] More moderate writers spoke of it as a very proper banquet attended by many good citizens, celebrating the anniversary of the decree which destroyed the titles of nobility. But they said it added excitement to that which was already aroused by the publication of the king's veto.[23] Everybody understood that something was about to happen, yet feared to speak of what really threatened.[24] A writer of the time said, "On the whole, sir, we stand on a vast volcano. We feel it tremble, we hear it roar, but how and when and where it will burst, and who may be destroyed by its eruptions, it is beyond the ken of mortal foresight to discover."[25] The people of the faubourgs believed

of the support of the minister of war and of his desire to keep in touch with him. Lafayette was called out from the interview by a messenger who brought him the news of the dismissal of the ministers. On hearing this he uttered a cry of joy. Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 9.

[20] *Moniteur*, XII, 703.

[21] Chaumette, *Mémoires*, 8–13; Lescure, *Correspondance secrète*, 601–03, *lettre* 20; Gorsas, *Récit générale* (*Extrait du courrier des 83 départements*).

[22] *Correspondance politique*, June 21, 1792, LXIII, 2; *Nouvelle correspondance politique*, June 22, 1792, XII, 2. This account is published in pamphlet form under title of *Le cri de douleur*.

[23] *Courrier des 83 départements*, June 22, 1792, IX. This account is also found in the pamphlet, *Récit générale et circonstancié des événemens du vingt juin; Le mercure universel*, June 22, 1792.

[24] Oelsner in *Revue historique*, LXXXIV, 71.

[25] Morris, *Diary and Letters*, I, 545.

Digitized by Google

themselves surrounded by plots and were ready to take the offensive. There was a growing belief in the king's treachery and the Tuileries were no longer considered inviolable.[26] A plan was concerted for the morrow for which the Girondins were not without responsibility.[27]

V

The Twentieth of June

There have been various explanations of the uprising of the 20th of June. One of these asserts that it was a deep laid conspiracy on the part of the Girondist leaders to reinstate themselves in power or to avenge themselves for their defeat.[1] Another asserts just as confidently that it was a popular demonstration, an instantaneous response of the masses to the king's refusal to sanction the decrees and to his dismissal of the three ministers.[2] Still a third explanation regards it as a reply to the letter of Lafayette, originating with the people or with the Jacobins.[3] Probably all of these statements contain a part of the truth. It was a popular demonstration and it did have leadership, but no plan of leaders, however skillful, could have succeeded in creating such general and intense feeling. The feeling must already have existed. It

[26] Paroy, *Mémoires,* 297; *Journal d'une bourgeoise,* 124, June 16, 1792; *Chronique du mois,* June 19, 1792; Chaumette, *Mémoires,* 12; Dreyfus in *Les femmes de la révolution française,* 1789–1795, says the people saw that the intrigues of the Tuileries would lead to the power of the Feuillants, i. e., the constitutional royalists would ally with royalists of the court.

[27] Masson, *Petites histoires,* série I, 246–58; Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* 212.

[1] Ternaux, I, 129–230; Louis Blanc, *Histoire de la révolution,* VIII, 53; Blanc-Gilli, *Lettre d'un député de l'assemblée nationale au département des Bouchesé-du-Rhône,* Paris, June 21, 1792.

[2] Aulard in *Révolution française,* XXXV, 532; *Lettre de Ph-Ch-Ai-Goupilleau, député de la Vendée,* Paris, June 20, 1792; *Correspondance secrète,* 601–02, Lettre 20; *Journal d'une bourgeoise,* 130–33, June 19, 1792.

[3] *Patriote français,* No. 1046, 689, June 21, 1792; Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792,* 212.

Digitized by Google

pervaded all Paris and had grown out of the actual condition of affairs. The leaders took advantage of its existence and turned it to account.

The greatest demonstration on this day came from the faubourgs and the reason for this is readily seen. The sections in the center of Paris were dominated by the royalist faction and had not the spirit for organized protest, but those of the faubourgs Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marcel had conserved all their vigorous sense of justice and of their rights and it was there that the great questions of the interests of the country and the means of saving it were discussed.[4]

It can not, however, be said that the 20th of June was solely the work of the sections even though some of them took part in it. Ever since the declaration of war in April, the sections, under the influence of the double danger from the enemy without and the court within had considered the question of organized resistance. Efforts were made to reestablish their state of permanence which had been suppressed by the law of May 21, 1790. In May and June seven sections demanded from the legislative assembly the authorization to constitute themselves in a state of permanent surveillance.[5] It was in this state of affairs that the king vetoed the decree against the priests and that for the formation of the camp. His action was freely discussed in the sections. The dismissal of the Girondist ministry intensified the excitement. A plan had already been formed to celebrate the anniversary of the oath of the tennis court and these circumstances gave the plan a revolutionary significance. The sections, Quinze-Vingts, Popincourt, Gobelins and others decided to go around to present petitions to the king and to the national assembly and at the same time to plant a tree of liberty upon the terrace of the Feuillants.[6]

[4] Chaumette, *Mémoires*, 12.

[5] Mellié, *Les sections de Paris pendant la révolution française*, 104–05. The names of these sections are: Theâtre-Français, Croix Rouge, Fontaine-de-Grenelle, Lombards, Luxembourg, Meauconseil, und Louvre.

[6] Mellié, *Les sections de Paris pendant la révolution française*, 104–05; Deliberations of the section Quinze-Vingts of June 19, in *Journal des débats et décrets*, No. 273, p. 359.

Digitized by Google

The rising was the outcome partly of the veto, the change of ministry and the consequent intrigues of the Girondins; but it was primarily a plan that had for some time occupied the leaders of the faubourgs Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marcel, who intended to celebrate the anniversary of the oath of the tennis court by a great popular demonstration that should serve as a warning to the king. The plan was to present a petition to him asking for the sanction of the decrees against the priests and for the formation of the camp.[7] They wished to impress the king by the aspect of the people in arms and so frighten him into sanctioning the decrees and recalling the ministry. But there was no attempt on this day to overturn the throne.

For perhaps a month there had been a ferment in the faubourg Saint-Antoine. The citizens had presented a petition to the council of the commune asking permission to assemble in the church, Enfants-Trouvées, at the close of services to be instructed upon the subject of "their rights and their duties." The municipality referred this petition to the directory of the department and charged Pétion with presenting it. In his letter to Roederer, June 2, Pétion recommended that the directory give the petition a favorable and prompt consideration on the ground that this would be a means of teaching the citizens patriotism and a knowledge of the laws.[8] By the middle of June the ferment had increased and for a week before the 20th we can see it not only in the faubourgs but in the assembly, in the clubs, Jacobin and Cordelier, and even in royal circles. The newspapers and all public gatherings reflected it.[9]

The subject of the leadership of this day is much in question.

[7] Clapham, *Causes of the War of 1792*, 212–13; Chaumette, *Mémoires*, 13; *Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 548; Carro, *Santerre*, 107.

[8] Letter of Pétion to Roederer, June 2, 1792, in Ternaux, I, 130.

[9] *Déclaration de Lareynie; Révolutions de Paris*, XII, 521; *Nouvelle correspondance politique*, XII, I; *Annales patriotiques et littéraries de la France*, LII, 669–748; *Journal royaliste*, No. 5, 1–2; *Correspondance politique* LXIII, 2; Aulard, *La société des Jacobins*, III, 688–706, IV, 1–21; Chaumette, *Mémoires*, 13; *Mémoires d'Alexandre*, Masson, *Petites histoires*, série I, 246–58; Soltho Douglas, "Observations du 19 et 20 juin, 1792," Archives Nationales, W/b 251.

Digitized by Google

Many assertions have been made regarding it for which no evidence has been produced. The Jacobins and the Girondins, collectively and individually, have been charged with being the instigators of the movement and with associating their party calculations with the popular excitement. The Jacobins Danton, Robespierre, Chabot and Lasource, the Girondins Brissot, Gaudet, Gensonné, Clavière, Roland and his wife, the municipal officers Pétion and Manuel and the editor Gorsas are all charged by one writer or another with being the leaders who remained in the shadow, the brains that directed the movement.[10] If these men were the real leaders, they remained in the background, for there is little or no evidence to place upon them responsibility for the uprising. It is only their well-known revolutionary sentiments and their power of leadership that has given rise to suspicion.

The evidence seems to indicate that the leaders of the Jacobins and the Girondins had in mind two distinct ideas of the advantages which might be gained by the uprising. The Girondins hoped to effect through this excitement the recall of their fallen ministry, while the Jacobins did not wish the recall of the Girondist ministry.

[10] Ternaux says (I, 131) that orders were given out by Danton and by other principal leaders who remained in the shadow; Louis Blanc, (VIII, 53), calls the Girondins, Roland, Clavière, Gensonné, Gaudet, Brissot and Madame Roland, the instigators; Clapham, (112), charges the day to the Jacobins; Robiquet, (483), calls Danton the great leader who gave orders to the men who met at the home of Santerre; Martin, (24–28), indiscriminately rails at Pétion, Vergniaud, Robespierre, Chabot and the Girondins especially Madame Roland, Brissot and Gaudet for responsibility in this uprising; Varenne, (19–20), calls Pétion chief of the conspirators and the editor Gorsas an instigator. Masson says, *Petites histoires,* I, 246–50, Pétion was an accomplice of Alexandre and Santerre; Lareynie says Pétion was at the home of Santerre about midnight June 19 in secret committee but this is hearsay evidence. Carro makes the same statement but does not give his authority. Documents show that Pétion was in his office from about nine o'clock till about two in the morning, as we shall see later. An anonymous pamphlet of the time also accuses Pétion of meeting with the leaders of June 20 and of meeting with Orleans at Rincy the morning of the 20th but the records show that he was in a meeting of the municipal corps all morning, *Déscription de la fête civique.* Royalist newspapers make similar statements, *Journal royalist,* No. 4, p. 3; *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* XII, 1, June 23, 1792.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

They desired the overthrow of the monarchy but did not think the time ripe for such action. They planned to await the arrival of the Marseillais, when a thorough revolution could be accomplished.

It has been stated that the leaders of the Girondist party, Roland, Clavière, Gensonné, Gaudet and Brissot met at the home of Madame Roland to weave a plot; that others less conspicuous took upon themselves the rôle of instigators, and that the watchword was, "Recall the good ministers."[11] A few years later at the trial of the Girondins, Chabot testified that Brissot and his adherents, wishing to rule through their ministry, formed a project for intervention by the people of the faubourgs for the recall of the dismissed ministers but that while the people were disposed to take part in such a movement, the recall of the ministry was the last thing they wished.[12]

The Jacobins, Robespierre and Chabot wanted a republic and feared that the recall of the Girondist ministry would only make permanent their constitutional chains. According to Chabot, Robespierre, convinced of the intrigue of the Girondins, charged him with going to the faubourg Saint-Antoine on the evening of the 19th to persuade the people to content themselves with a simple petition for the sanction of the decrees, and to await the arrival of the Marseillais and then direct their movements toward overturning the throne.[13]

It is true that Chabot was in the faubourg Saint Antoine on the

[11] "Notice historique sur les événements du 10 août, 1792, et des 20 et 21 juin précédents," par Sargent-Marceau, *Revue rétrospective*, 2. série, III.

[12] *Histoire parlementaire*, XXX, 40, "Procès des Girondins."

[13] *Ibid.*, 40–41, Testimony of Chabot. If Chabot's testimony is to be accepted, Brissot on the morning of the 21st admitted that he was one of the agitators and that he believed the movement had produced the desired effect of returning Roland, Clavière and Servan to the ministry; that when he and his accomplices saw that they could not influence the court they proposed a union with the Jacobins promising to effect the overthrow of the throne, but that later he pronounced against the Jacobins for demanding this measure. This, however, is the evidence of a man who was bitterly partisan against Brissot and who when he made the statement was on trial for his life and was trying to connect Brissot with his own crime.

Digitized by Google

evening of June 19, speaking in the church Enfants-Trouvées from about 9:30 to 12:30 o'clock, but there is no evidence that he tried to give the movement a revolutionary character.[14] He made an effort to have a decree passed in the section Quinze-Vingts to the effect that they should present their petition to the king and to the assembly unarmed.[15] He asserts that he succeeded but that the emissaries of the faction induced the people to arm themselves after he left.[16]

As to Robespierre, his plan was to reserve all action for a decisive blow. He spoke much at the Jacobins to this effect. On June 13 he said, speaking of saving the country, that "it would not be done by partial insurrections, which only weaken the public cause."[17] The same sentiment was expressed by Camille Desmoulins, who said in the Jacobin club on June 19, "Without doubt I regard insurrection as indispensable, but let us above all things guard against partial insurrections."[18]

Danton, also, has been accused of causing this uprising, but there is no proof of this assertion.[19] While it is true that the debates in the Jacobin club were menacing in tone, expressing feelings out of which the 20th of June might have grown, and while it is also true that Danton, Robespierre, Camille Desmoulins and Lasource spoke vigorously—facts which may have given rise to statements that these men were the leaders—there is nothing in their speeches that can directly connect them with instigating the uprising.[20] Danton, on June 13, declared that he would

[14] *Ibid.*, 40–41; *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* XII, 2, June 22, 1792. This article is reprinted in a pamphlet of the time, *Le cri de douleur; Journal royalist* No. 4, June 22, 1792; *Correspondance politique,* LXIII, 2.

[15] "Procès-verbal de la séance du 19 juin de la section des Quinze-Vingts" in *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 273, p. 359; *Histoire parlementaire,* XXX, 40.

[16] *Ibid.*, XXX, 40–41.

[17] Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* III, 698.

[18] *Ibid.*, IV, 20.

[19] Ternaux, I, 313; Robiquet, *Le personnel municipal de Paris,* 482–83; Aulard, *Etudes et leçons, 4. série,* 192.

[20] *Ibid., Société des Jacobins,* III, 688–706; IV, 1–21.

Digitized by Google

"engage to carry terror into a perverse court" but on the 14th in pronouncing a withering discourse upon this court he explained that the means he would use were twofold; first, to levy a tax on the rich and second, to send Marie Antoinette back to Austria.[21] On June 18, he delivered another bitter discourse against Lafayette demanding that he be called to account before the bar of the assembly for the letter he had written to it.[22] But none of these addresses refer in any way to the uprising of June 20. It has been more justly stated that he kept himself apart and permitted the uprising and did not regret that Louis XVI was so forcibly warned by the people, but that he wished to avoid bloodshed. His dream was of a peaceful revolution.[23]

The ostensible leaders of the uprising were of a different type. Chief among them were Santerre and Alexandre, commandants of the battalions Enfants-Trouvées and Saint Marcel, men of considerable standing and influence in the faubourgs. Of less prominence were the marquis Saint Huruge and the Pole Lazowsky, captain of cannoneers in the faubourg Saint Marcel. There were others who stirred the people up, such as Fournier, known as the "American," an elector of the department of Paris of 1791, Rotonde the Italian, Legendre the butcher from the faubourg Saint German and one Curiette Verrieres. Besides these, there were a small number of confederates of the faubourg Saint-Antoine, such as Rossignol, the future general, then a journeyman goldsmith, Nicolas, a sapper of the battalion Enfants-Trouvées, Brierre, a wine merchant, Gonor, calling himself victor of the Bastille and others.[24]

Alexandre has been referred to as the man who played the major rôle on June 20 and who was almost master of Paris in

[21] *Ibid.*, III, 699–703.

[22] *Ibid.*, IV, 11.

[23] *Ibid., Etudes et leçons, 4. série,* 192.

[24] "Déclaration de Lareynie." This declaration was received among others by the justice of the peace of the section Roi de Sicile, June 24, 1792. It is not first-hand evidence. The author states that he learned these things through correspondence and information from the faubourgs during the week before June 20th.

Digitized by Google

1792.[25] While he was an important character on this day he did not play as important a rôle as did the wealthy brewer of the faubourg Saint Antoine, Antoine Joseph Santerre. This man was king in the faubourgs, rough in his manner but kindly of heart. By royalist writers he has been called ignorant, brutal, debauched and insolent.[26] A glimpse of his life will serve to put a different interpretation upon him. His father, also a brewer, and his mother died early, leaving a large family. Antoine Joseph was thrown upon his own resources at eighteen but previous to this time had been in college where he studied especially history, physics and chemistry. At twenty he bought a brewery. He married happily but lost his wife before the close of the year. He married again but domestic unhappiness drove him to spend his leisure hours among the people of the faubourgs. He had a reputation for kindness to his servants, generosity to the poor, and consideration for his employees and so became very popular in the faubourg. He took part in the storming of the Bastille and with his battalion followed Lafayette on the 5th and 6th of October. He often displayed great courage in the face of danger, several times facing a mob to save a man from hanging or a woman from violence or buildings from being burned. He was one of the

[25] Masson, *Petites histoires,* 1. série, 246–58. Alexandre's business had been that of a stock broker. He gave this up, entered the national guards, took some instructions and was elected captain of cannoneers of the Gobelins, then chief of battalion of the Gobelins, finally provisional chief of the sixth division of the national guard of Paris. Alexandre's own account of his career is found in an extract from his *Mémoires;* the manuscript of these *Mémoires* is in the possession of M. Frédéric Masson of Paris. In September, 1792, Alexandre was allowed an indemnity of 12000 francs for valuable services rendered before and after the 10th of August. The convention made him minister of war, June 22, 1792, for one day. His name was proposed by the committee of public safety but the idea of making a minister of war of a stockbroker was so inconsistent that the assembly reconsidered its vote next day. (*Moniteur,* XVI, 892.) Alexandre was named commissioner of war which office he held for eight years and then became a member of the tribunate under the consulate. Documents in support of this are found in Ternaux I, 394.

[26] Varenne, *Histoire particulière,* 21.

Digitized by Google

guards at the Tuileries after the king's flight and it is said was recognized by the king and queen and conversed with them and even received overtures from the queen to desert the popular cause. He was compromised in the affair of the Champ de Mars as being an Orleanist and sought safety in hiding to avoid being arrested. He was generous of heart, giving freely of his money to the poor and distributing free beer to the people. He was daring in the execution of his plans but not cruel nor wicked. Idolized by the people he could lead them wherever he chose.[27]

About the middle of June the leaders of the faubourgs began to assemble nightly, sometimes meeting in the house of Santerre and sometimes in the hall of the committee of the section Quinze-Vingts. At these meetings plans were drawn up for the uprising. Topics were selected to be debated in popular gatherings at the Tuileries, at the Palais Royal, in the Place de Grève and at the Porte Saint-Antoine. Incendiary placards were prepared to be posted up in the faubourgs and petitions were formulated to be carried by deputations to the patriotic societies of Paris and the famous petition presented to the assembly on the 20th of June was framed.[28] This definite work seems to have been done on June 15.[29]

On June 16, a deputation of ten citizens representing the petitioners from the faubourgs and led by Lazowsky was sent to

[27] Carro, *Santerre*, 1–99. The statements found here are drawn from Carro's Life of Santerre. See critical bibliography for the value of this material. One of these statements, at least, is borne out by an extract from the register of the executive council, April 6, 1793, showing that Santerre obtained a discharge of a tax of 49,603 livres which he owed to the government for 1789 and 1790 for his manufacture of beer. The report of the minister of finance declared that this beer having been consumed chiefly for patriotic ends there was reason for remitting this tax. The documents are found in Ternaux, I, 389 ff. It is also shown by these documents that Santerre had asked favors of Necker and Delessart before June 20 and of Bonaparte after the 18th brumaire. He held the title of *Maréchal de camp* and later, general of division under the revolutionary government.

[28] "Déclaration de Lareynie," June 24, 1792.

[29] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 18.

Digitized by Google

the municipality at the Hôtel de Ville to announce "to the council that the citizens of the faubourgs Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marcel had resolved to present, Wednesday, the 20th, to the national assembly and to the king, petitions relative to the circumstances and to plant a liberty tree upon the terrace of the Feuillants, in memory of the oath of the tennis court. They asked that the council authorize them to wear the uniforms and carry the arms that they used in 1789."[30]

The council of the commune on the motion of Borie refused to grant this request and passed the following decree the same day: "The council having deliberated . . . and considering that the law forbids all armed assemblies not a part of the legally required public defense, passes to the order of the day." The council ordered this decree sent to the directory of the department and to the department of police and that it should be communicated to the municipal government.[31] According to the law of June 27, 1790, the work of communicating this decree to the magistrates was the duty of the mayor.[32]

According to Borie the delegates when they received this answer were defiant and stated haughtily that nothing could prevent them

[30] Extract from the register of the council of the commune; (*Compte rendu,*) "Conduite tenue par M. le maire de Paris;" "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Borie." The names of the men who carried the request to the council of the commune are Lazowsky, captain of cannoneers of the battalion Saint-Marcel, Duclos, Pavie, Lebon, Lachapelle, Lejeune, Vasson, citizens of the section Quinze-Vingts, Geney, Deliens and Bertrand, citizens of the section Gobelins. Lazowsky was a friend of the Duke of Liancourt. He had been factory inspector before the revolution. He was also an intimate friend and sometime travelling companion of Arthur Young. (*Travels in France*). He was once a colleague of Roland, later a friend and member of the Jacobins by whom according to Madame Roland (*Mémoires,* II, 193), he was almost canonized when he died in March, 1793, though his death was a result of debauchery. He was buried in the Place du Carrousel. Michaud, *Biographie universelle,* XXIII, 441.

[31] See the decree in an extract from the register of the council of the commune, *Compte rendu,* 4; "Procès-verbal dressé par Borie."

[32] "Rapport fait au conseil du département par M. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort," 240.

Digitized by Google

from carrying out their designs.[83] The fermentation continued and during the following days the popular movement grew to greater proportions. Alexandre said that after the 15th or 16th one could easily foresee the approaching movement. By the 18th and 19th people talked only of the coming event and the excitement extended even to the Tuileries and vicinity.[84]

In the face of such an uprising as now threatened, it would be expected that the mayor of Paris would adopt a vigorous policy to suppress any disorder. He not only failed to meet this expectation but the evidence seems to indicate that he carefully avoided knowing anything about the movement. It was difficult for Pétion to reconcile his personal feelings with his official duties, but he evidently felt that he must keep up an appearance of performing his duty so that if the movement failed he would not lose his office. He was known for his attachment to the principles of liberty.[85] That his sympathies were with the republican doctrines, we divine from his attitude toward the faubourg Saint-Antoine when it asked permission on June 2 to form a club which should meet in the church Enfants-Trouvées at the close of services "for the purpose of being instructed in their rights and their duties."[86]

He was evidently absent from the Hôtel de Ville, June 16, when the deputation from the faubourgs presented their petition and so did not receive the decree of the council until June 18. On that day two copies were addressed to him by the secretary

[83] "Procès-verbal dressé par Borie"; Ternaux, (I, 318) makes this statement on a declaration of J. J. Leroux, but the statement is not found in his declaration.

[84] Masson, *Petites histoires,* 1. série, 246–58; Extract from Alexandre's *Mémoires;* "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers"; *Journal d'une bourgeoise,* 310, letter to her husband, June 19, 1792; "Rapport de police," Soltho Douglas, "Observations du 19 et 20 juin, 1792," Archives Nationales W/b 251; letter of Terrier to the directory, June 19, 1792 in *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur,* 1.

[85] Mémoires d'Alexandre" in Masson, *Petites histoires,* 1. série, 246–58; *Journal d'une bourgeoise,* 130, Letter to her husband, June 19, 1792. She says Pétion was between Scylla and Charybdis.

[86] Letter of Pétion to Roederer, June 2, 1792, referred to above.

Digitized by Google

of the council together with a letter reminding the mayor of the provisions of the decree for its communication. A third copy was addressed by the secretary to the department of police.[37] Pétion seems to have been absent from his office when this letter reached it on June 18. His chief secretary, because of the urgency of the case, sent an unsigned letter to Roederer enclosing a copy of the decree, adding that the same letter, officially signed, would be sent him tomorrow.[38] Later, on the same day, Pétion sent a letter to Roederer informing him of the proceedings of the commune on the 16th, enclosing a copy of the decree and asking him to communicate it to the directory.[39] But he gave no orders for the suppression of the movement.

Later, when the mayor was accused of failing in the discharge of his duties on this occasion, he justified his inaction by saying that this request of the 16th was one of individuals who desired to march without being assembled under the flag of the military force or without being directed by the officers recognized by law.[40] Plainly the mayor of Paris was not disposed to make any effort to allay the fermentation.

The directory, although it had no legal right to act directly in this case, was much concerned for the public peace. It spared no efforts to maintain the peace and by means of letters, decrees and conferences tried to force the mayor and the municipal officers to repress the uprising.[41] After having received a com-

[37] See the letter from the secretary of the council of the commune to Pétion, (Ternaux, I, 139), enclosing copies of the decree.

[38] Letter from Pétion's office to Roederer, June 18, 1792, in *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 162–63.

[39] Letter of Pétion to Roederer, June 18, 1792, in *Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces*, No. 1.

[40] "Conduite tenue par M. le Maire."

[41] The administrators composing the directory of the department of Paris were La Rochefoucauld, president, Anson, vice president, Garnier (Germain), substitute for the procureur, Davous, Talleyrand, Brousse des Faucherets, Trion de Chaume, Démeunier, and Briois. Of this organization, Blondel was secretary and Roederer, prosecuting attorney. It was an essentially aristocratic body. The list of names of all the members of the department is found in Lacroix, *Le département de Paris et de la Seine pendant la révolution*, 212.

Digitized by Google

munication from Roederer, it wrote to the mayor and to the municipality, at noon on June 19, reminding them of their duty and asking them to meet with the directory between two and three o'clock.[42] It wrote another letter to Pétion suggesting that he issue a proclamation stating the laws relative to public peace, calling attention to the former decree of the municipality regarding armed defense and requested that he ask the citizens to maintain order.[43] Between two and three o'clock the mayor and the police attended the meeting of the directory. The session was evidently a stormy one, for the situation was freely discussed.[44] At this meeting the directory, in the presence of Pétion, passed a decree declaring that it had learned from several sources that notwithstanding the decree of the council of the commune, evil-minded persons still intended to form armed assemblies under pretext of presenting petitions; that they thought that the public should be reminded of the law which forebade an assemblage of armed citizens and of the municipal law which authorized the sending of a deputation of twenty citizens to present petitions; that the people ought not to insult the council which had refused the request of the faubourgs on the 16th by allowing an armed gathering nor offend the majesty of the representatives of the people by presenting themselves before them armed. The directory then decreed that the mayor, the municipality and the commandant should be warned without delay to take all possible measures to prevent armed assemblies that would violate law and use all the force at their disposal to prevent disturbance of the public peace, and for citizens, national guards and all composing the armed force to hold themselves ready to assist if necessary.[45] Pursuant to this decree, Pétion immediately dispatched orders to the commandant and to the administrators of police to execute the decree.[46] He instructed the commandant to keep the posts

[42] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[43] This letter is found in Ternaux, I, 140, note 2.

[44] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[45] Decree of the directory, June 19, 1792.

[46] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 19, says that the mayor wrote these letters at the desk of the directory; "Rapport fait au conseil

Digitized by Google

filled, to double the guards at the Tuileries and at the national assembly, to have at his disposal reserves of infantry and cavalry and to take every measure to maintain order.[47] He also wrote to the commissioners of police instructing them to keep the peace.[48] He then summoned the commandants of the two faubourgs to come to the mayoralty at nine o'clock in the evening.[49] It also appears that some time before the evening of the 19th he had written a letter to the president of the section Quinze-Vingts, asking that the citizens do not go armed to the assembly nor to the king.[50]

Meantime the minister of the interior, Terrier de Montciel,[51] had heard alarming reports concerning the tranquillity of Paris and wrote to the directory at 2:30 o'clock asking to be kept informed of the situation so that he might at once render an account to the king.[52] The directory received this letter of inquiry while it was deliberating and responded at once with a copy of its decree and asked Terrier to communicate it to the national assembly.[53] Ever since the letter of Lafayette to the assembly had

du département par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort," *Revue rétrospective,* 2. série, I, 241.

[47] "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers"; "Rapport de Roederer," *Histoire parlementaire,* XV, 424. Ternaux states (I, 141, note) that he has found the minutes of this letter and that it adds at the end the mayor's authorization to make requisition for regular troops if they are needed by the commandant.

[48] Letter of Pétion to Dumont, commissioner of police, Section Montreuil, June 19, 1792; "Rapport fait au conseil du départment par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort"; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[49] "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux, I, 407; "Rapport fait au conseil de départment par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort"; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[50] *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 273, p. 360. This gives, in the report of the proceedings of the assembly for June 25, a *procès-verbal* of the section Quinze-Vingts for June 19, evening session.

[51] Terrier unlike Pétion was out of sympathy with republican doctrines. He belonged to the party of Lameth and Duport. Glagau, 339, Mercy to Kaunitz, June 27, 1792.

[52] *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur,* 1, letter of Terrier to the directory, June 19, 1792, 2:30 o'clock.

[53] *Ibid.,* Letter of the directory to Terrier, June 19, 1792.

Digitized by Google

been made public, there had been a feeling of unrest and fear at the Tuileries which had grown with each new report and now bordered on terror. The king had made his will, had gone to confession and it was said that the members of the royal family had given gifts as last souvenirs to their personal friends. It was also reported that a week before, the king had said, "I know the dark projects they have against me; I shall be at Saint-Denis within a fortnight providing that they will allow my body to lie beside those of my ancestors."[54] It was furthermore believed that the king was preparing to leave Paris. On June 18, Pétion received a letter from Bayonne, without signature and without date, that informed him that the king was going to leave Paris at two o'clock in the morning. Pétion summoned the commandant to suspend all other business and come to him without delay as he had need of a conference with him on this matter.[55] This feeling at the Tuileries was an incentive to Terrier to keep informed upon the situation. He showed the greatest solicitude for the royal family from this moment on.

The assembly held a session on this same evening, June 19, which was full of interest because of two occurrences, the reading of the petition of the Marseillais and of the decree of the directory. A deputation of citizens from Marseilles was introduced at the bar of the assembly and announced that the liberty of France was in danger and that the free men of the south were ready to march to its defense. They continued:

"The day of the people's anger has arrived. The people they have tried to kill and chain down is weary of defending itself and now is ready to take the offensive; weary of baffling conspiracies . . . the generous lion,

[54] Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* IV, 9; *Correspondance entre le comte de Mirabeau et le comte de La Marck,* III, 318, Montmorin to La Marck, June 19, 1792; "Rapport de police, Observations de 19 juin," Soltho Douglas, Archives Nationales, W/b 251; "Rapport de police," June 20, 1792, Archives Nationales, 4387; *Annales patriotiques,* No. CLXXII, p. 757; *Journal royalist,* No. 5, p. 4; *Lettre de Blanc-Gilli. député de l'assemblée nationale,* June 21, 1792; Paroy, *Mémoires,* 297; *L'indicateur,* No. 34, June 22, 1792.

[55] Letter of Pétion to Romainvilliers, June 18, 1792, Archives Nationales F^{7}4474^{70}. The letter from Bayonne was enclosed.

Digitized by Google

today enraged, is ready to spring from its repose upon the pack of its enemies. Representatives, the popular force is your force. You have it in hand, use it. Give no quarter since you can expect none. The French people ask for a decree authorizing them to march with a more imposing force than any heretofore. Command and we will march upon the capital and to the frontiers. A struggle between despotism and liberty must be a struggle to the death. . . . Representatives, the people wish absolutely to finish a revolution which is its safety and its glory, which is the honor of the human mind; it wishes to save itself and to save you. Ought you to prevent this sublime movement?"

This shows the intensity of public feeling on the eve of June 20. The petition was received by some with enthusiasm and by others with cries of "incendiary and unconstitutional." One member thought it not astonishing that men born under burning skies should show an ardent imagination and an energetic patriotism. After a lively debate and amidst applause the printing was voted and it was decreed that a copy should be sent to each of the eighty-three departments.[56]

The excitement had scarcely died down when the president announced that the minister of the interior had addressed a decree of the directory of the department of Paris to the assembly. The reading was called for. Immediately Saladin cried, "We have no time to lose in reading it." But Becquet insisted upon the reading, saying that the assembly should become acquainted with the decrees passed by the administrative body when it is a question of public order; that every one knew that the people were being stirred up at this time, and that it was understood by all that tomorrow would be a stormy day; that the reading should be heard with a view to taking action on the subject. Vergniaud called forth applause and laughter by some sarcastic remarks about Becquet being always so constitutional yet wishing to overturn the laws so that the national assembly might occupy itself with police measures. He opposed the reading of the decree of the department on the ground that if the assembly listened to the reading and took no action it would give a species of sanction to it and free the officers from their responsibility. Rouyer reminded the

[56] *Moniteur,* XII, 710; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 257; *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 546.

Digitized by Google

assembly that it had asked the mayor to report the situation of the city every day and that it could scarcely refuse to hear the decree of the department that shared its solicitude. The reading was received in silence.[57] Did this silence signify "tacit approbation, calculated indifference or disguised blame?" A contemporary ventures the assertion that there was an understanding between the leaders of the movement and the principal men in the assembly to the effect that the assembly would give its approval by its silence.[58]

Meantime the excitement in the faubourgs had reached its highest pitch. In the faubourg Saint-Antoine, the section Quinze-Vingts held a meeting in the church, Enfants-Trouvées, beginning about eight o'clock and lasting until after one. It was attended by over a thousand citizens. A decree was passed providing for the section to join with other sections in presenting a petition to the king and to the assembly to invite the commissioners of the section, the commissioners of police and the justice of the peace to go with them. The petition to the assembly was read and adopted. A deputation from the committee of the section Popincourt presented itself asking that the section might join the Quinze-Vingts in presenting the petition to the assembly. This was joyfully received. The address to the king was then read and adopted with slight change.

Chabot then spoke to the meeting informing them of the address of the Marseillais which had been read in the legislative assembly that evening. He also urged the citizens to go to the assembly and to the king unarmed and to conduct themselves peacefully and with moderation on the morrow and so to give the lie to the semi-prophecy of Lafayette on the subject of pretended regicides. But when the citizens pronounced strongly in favor of going to the assembly armed, the president of the section stated that Pétion in a letter to him had requested that they do not present themselves armed either to the king or to the

[57] *Moniteur*, XII, 710–11; *Journal des débats et décrets*, No. 267, p. 259.
[58] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 23.

Digitized by Google

assembly.[59] It is also said that Chabot closed his address with, "My children, the national assembly awaits you tomorrow, without fail, with open arms."[60]

This meeting was also attended by Alexandre, commandant of the battalion Saint-Marcel. It was here according to his own statement that he received his summons from Pétion and the administrators of police to meet with them at the mayoralty at nine o'clock. He told the assembly of his summons and asked them not to dismiss their meeting until his return. He came back, he claimed, at one o'clock and gave an account of what had passed at the mayoralty. He also learned that in his absence the section had decided to march on the morrow and he was given a letter by the president of the section asking him to go to the meeting place on the Boulevard de l'Hôpital at eight o'clock in the morning. During the day he had received a letter from the president of the section of the Gobelins asking him to join the citizens on the march, because his presence would help to maintain order in so great a crowd of people.[61] We have no record of Santerre's attendance at this meeting, though he must have been there, being the first citizen of the faubourg. There is very little evidence of Santerre's activities in the preparations for this uprising, but there is no doubt whatever of his leadership on the day of the uprising. According to the testimony of three other commandants he had sent invitations by letter or by deputation to them, asking them to march with the battalion Enfants-Trouvées on the 20th and had invited clubs in their district, asking their coöperation. Newspapers and police reports also show him the prime mover.[62]

Other sections besides the Quinze-Vingts sat all night, among

[59] "Procès-verbal de la séance du 19 juin de la section des Quinze-Vingts," in *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 273, p. 359–60.

[60] "Déclaration de Thurot, volontaire grenadier de bataillon du petit Saint-Antoine, June 24, 1792;" Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 19. Thurot says he learned this from a man who had attended the meeting. Roederer does not state his authority.

[61] "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux, I, 407.

[62] "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce"; "Section de Montreuil, Procès-verbal de la protestation de MM. Bonneau

Digitized by Google

them Popincourt and the Gobelins. These heard addresses, passed decrees and exchanged fraternal deputations with each other. They also sent letters to the commandants urging them to march with the people.[63] Plainly, there was activity and communication all night long among leaders, officers, clubs and sections in the faubourgs.

Of Pétion's whereabouts or activities from the close of the meeting of the directory till nine o'clock that evening we have no record. We have seen that he called the chiefs of the faubourgs to him at nine o'clock in the evening.[64] At this meeting there were four administrators of police present, Panis, Sergent, Vigner and Perron, and four or more commandants of battalions of the faubourgs, Santerre of Enfants-Trouvées, Alexandre of Saint-Marcel, Saint-Prix of Val-de-Grâce, Savin, second in command of Saint-Marguerite, and possibly Bonneau, chief of the same battalion.[65] Toward ten o'clock the commandants arrived, Alexandre appearing first and Saint-Prix last.[66]

---

et Savin"; "Rapport fait au conseil du département par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort."

[63] "Procès-verbal de la seance du 19 juin de la section des Quinze-Vingts" in *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 273, p. 359-60; "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux, I, 407; "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grace," No. 4, des Pièces justificatives.

[64] The letter of convocation sent to Saint-Prix is found in *Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces,* XXXV, No. 1 of *Pièces justificatives* added to Saint-Prix's report.

[65] "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grace"; "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux I, 407; "Rapport et conclusion de le procureur-général-syndic du département" in *Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces,* 15; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire." Bonneau is not mentioned by name as attending this meeting. Pétion says he summoned the commandants and mentions Santerre and Alexandre and the "other commandants." Roederer speaks as if all were present. Alexandre names Santerre and "other commandants" whom he did not know. Saint-Prix names Alexandre, Santerre and Savin. Since Bonneau was chief and Savin second in command we infer that Bonneau was one of the "other commandants."

[66] Alexandre says he saw Santerre and others arrive. Saint-Prix says he found, when he arrived, Santerre, Alexandre and Savin.

Digitized by Google

Pétion and the administrators of police asked them to state the disposition of the citizens in their sections and in their battalions. For Santerre's answer we have only Pétion's report, but Alexandre and Saint-Prix have left their own accounts. Each would have us believe that he answered first and that he suggested legalizing the movement. Santerre assured them "that nothing in the world could prevent the national guards and the citizens from marching, that all remonstrance was absolutely useless, that the inhabitants of the vicinity of Paris had joined them, that they had made a fête day of it and that they would answer to any argument that might be made, 'that they ought to receive the same treatment as others whom the assembly had received.'"[67] Alexandre affirmed that the same sentiment existed in his faubourg and declared that it would be dangerous to use force to prevent what was firmly resolved upon. He said he had not noticed any disposition on the part of the people to insult either individuals or the constituted authorities and that a wise and simple course of action would be not to try to prevent the project, but to direct it, to legalize it in some way and then he would answer for it. He said in reply to the mayor's reference to the departmental decree that it was a very good measure in itself but came too late. When asked what his personal idea was, he answered without hesitation that if the citizens did not change their minds he had resolved to march with them. He reasoned that if he did not go, he would irritate his fellow citizens and lose their confidence and still not prevent the march. He would thus lose the personal advantage of protection for his person and his home and friends and thereby gain no advantage for public affairs. On the contrary, if he marched with them he would keep their confidence and prevent them "from committing any excesses and would moderate their enthusiasm and their impatience, if they should be provoked or insulted, as there was reason, from reports, to believe they would be."[68] Other commandants did not answer in as positive a manner because they had

[67] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire"

[68] "Rapport d'Alexandre," in Ternaux, I, 407.

Digitized by Google

not such positive knowledge but all said that there was much fermentation.[69] Saint-Prix told the mayor that six weeks before, all was peaceable but that since then a club had been formed at the Porte Saint-Marcel, which had excited the people and induced them to carry a petition under arms to the national assembly and to the king and that this club had been invited by a letter from Santerre to join his battalion. Santerre admitted the correspondence, but denied that he had taken the initiative. Saint-Prix then advised the mayor to follow what he considered a policy of prudence. He said that since he could not prevent the procession, he had better legalize it. He advised him to go with the municipality to the place of assembling and read the decree of the department and state to the people in a proclamation that a petition presented under arms is illegal and request them to lay down their arms before entering the assembly and the king's palace. He suggested that Pétion precede the petitioners accompanied by officers of the municipality and that he order the commandant to furnish a number of volunteers from the battalions to protect the march of the petitioners and so give it a legal character.[70]

This suggestion struck Pétion as a means of escape from his dilemma, for he and his colleagues feared lest they should be reduced to the necessity of using force against a great multitude of citizens. They withdrew from the conference into an adjoining apartment and consulted together in regard to some means of influencing the department to change its decree.[71] At about midnight Vigner was sent to Roederer with a letter signed by Pétion and the four administrators of police stating the situation in the faubourgs as they had learned it from the commandants and proposing that the directory adopt some means that would be at the same time prudent and legal. They suggested that the armed citizens be grouped around the national guard under the authority

[69] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."
[70] "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce."
[71] "Rapport d'Alexandre," "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

Digitized by Google

of its chiefs and that the magistrates authorize the commandants of the battalions to march with them.[72]

Pétion then returned to the leaders of the faubourgs and dismissed them saying he would inform them of the department's answer. He asked them to write to their commandant and request him to give them such instructions as he thought suitable. It was now one o'clock in the morning of the 20th.[73] Vigner on his return at one-thirty reported that Roederer approved Pétion's suggestion and would assemble the directory to act upon it. Pétion, feeling sure that that body could not but approve his suggestion, wrote to several of the officers to come to the mayoralty at seven o'clock in the morning to bring him news. He then retired.[74] Meantime Roederer wrote Pétion requesting that he send an administrator of police with a letter to the directory.[75] Neither Pétion nor Roederer mention this letter in their reports and we do not know Roederer's object in sending for the administrator of police.

In answer to Roederer's call the directory assembled at four o'clock in the morning.[76] After a lively discussion it was unanimously recognized that they could not receive in the ranks of the national guard men almost wholly unknown, without recognition, already in open rebellion, armed with all sorts of weapons, who might sow the seeds of disorder in the military force and

---

[72] The mayor and administrators of police, Pétion, Sergent, Panis, Vigner and Perron to the Directory, June 20, 1792 at midnight.

[73] "Rapport d'Alexandre"; "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce," Saint-Prix.

[74] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[75] We have not this letter and neither Pétion nor Roederer mention it in their accounts, but Pétion's letter to Roederer at five o'clock says he is sending an administrator of police to the directory "in accordance with the request of your letter" and in his letter to Sergent at the same hour he says, "go immediately to the directory of the department at the request of the enclosed letter." Pétion to Roederer, June 20, 1792, five o'clock a. m. Pétion to Sergent, June 20, 1792, five o'clock a. m. Archives Nationales, F[7]4774[70].

[76] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 20.

Digitized by Google

in case of sedition make it impossible to act.[77] They replied to Pétion with a letter at five o'clock saying, "We can not, under any circumstances, compromise the law which we have sworn to execute; it lays down our duty imperatively. We must persist in our decree of yesterday." Pétion, wakened perhaps by Roederer's messenger, and not having received the reply from the directory, sent a second letter by Sergent dated at five o'clock. This was a reply to Roederer's call for an administrator of police. It stated that "the measure indicated is the only practicable one especially in circumstances where the citizens cannot be notified and are already assembled."[78] In addition to the letter Sergent made a strong plea to the directory, still in session, in favor of legalizing, saying that the citizens had taken action irrevocably and that it would be impossible to prevent their movement. They answered him that they would give a general alarm and Sergent reminded them that for such a course written orders were necessary.[79] But they persisted in their decree and Roederer answered Pétion's letter by a postscript written on the decree of the directory stating that the decision could not be changed.[80]

The directory then wrote to the commandant at five-thirty o'clock renewing instructions to him to discharge his duty in conformity with the decree of the night before, even to calling the troops under arms, if the danger were pressing.[81] They also wrote to the minister of the interior at six o'clock to tell him of the proposition of the municipality and of the directory's peremptory refusal, enclosing copies of the correspondence, and stating

[77] Decree of the directory of July 6, 1792, which suspended Pétion from office.

[78] Pétion to Roederer, five o'clock a. m., June 20, 1792. Pétion in his report omits mention of this second letter which is mentioned by both Roederer and Sergent.

[79] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent." According to the law of Nov. 20, 1791, the mayor alone had the right to give orders in such cases. "Rapport fait au conseil du département par MM. Garnier, Levillard et Demantort," 249.

[80] Directory to the mayor and municipal officers, June 20, 1792, five o'clock a. m.; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 20.

[81] Directory to the commandant, June 20, 1792, five-thirty a. m.

Digitized by Google

their orders to the commandant. They wrote him again at seven o'clock saying the faubourgs would present a petition but would go unarmed.[82] Thus, we see, the directory, in contrast with the municipality, showed great interest in suppressing the movement. Roederer and the greater part of the members spent the night in the hall and held a full session at four o'clock, in the morning. As we have seen they answered dispatches of the municipality and gave orders to the commandant of the national guards. They also sent out officers to learn the state of Paris and decided to go to the assembly as soon as it should meet in the morning to say to that body that the custom which it had established of receiving armed deputations in its midst was responsible for this situation, was the obstacle to the success of the remonstrances against these petitioners.[83] The refusal of the directory destroyed all Pétion's plans. He says he was overwhelmed with the thought of the abyss into which this act might plunge his fellow citizens. Nevertheless he executed the ideas of the directory. He wrote to the four chiefs of the battalions, Santerre, Alexandre, Saint-Prix and Bonneau, saying, "We inform you again that you can not assemble in arms. See in this connection the letter that the directory has sent us. After this letter we understand too well your patriotism not to expect that you will conform, and instruct your fellow citizens."[84] These letters were received by Alexandre at seven o'clock and by Saint-Prix at seven-thirty. Their answers expressed a willingness to execute the order but Alexandre said he could not answer for anything.[85] After writing

[82] Directory to Terrier, June 20, 1792, six o'clock a. m.; Directory to Terrier, June 20, 1792, seven o'clock a. m. in *Rapport du ministre de l'interieur.*

[83] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 23.

[84] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire"; "Rapport de qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce" in "Pièces justificatives," No. III, "Procès-verbal de la protestation de MM. Bonneau et Savin" in same, No. IX; The only direct statement that Santerre received this letter is made by these other men; "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux, I, 407; Longchamp to Pétion, June 20, 1792, in Archives Nationales $F^{7}4774^{70}$.

[85] Alexandre to Pétion, June 20, 1792, Archives Nationales $F^{7}4774^{70}$. The original of this letter is signed Renaud, Com. of Saint-Marcel. I have not

Digitized by Google

these letters Pétion at once convoked the municipality for the morning.[86] While waiting for the members to assemble and realizing the gravity of the situation he sent some administrators of police, Sargent and Panis to the faubourg Saint-Antoine and Perron and Vigner to the faubourg Saint-Marcel. This was between seven and eight o'clock.[87] At about eight-thirty he sent three municipal officers to the faubourg Saint-Marcel where there seemed to be the greatest fermentation. He charged them to make every effort to prevent the gathering of armed men or to disperse them if they were already gathered, and to prevent the union of others with them.[88]

The commandants of the battalions of the faubourgs now found themselves with conflicting instructions. They were subject to extra requisitions from their sections as well as to orders from the commandant of the national guards. As noted above, the sections that had remained sitting all night asked their commandants to march with them. We saw that Alexandre had been asked by the Gobelins and the Quinze-Vingts to march with them. The section of the Gobelins by a decree asked Saint-Prix to march at their head and help them in the ceremony of planting the liberty tree on the terrace of the Feuillants. He answered that he could not lead his battalion without a legal order, but as a citizen he would go to the section unarmed. In addition to these invitations three commandants, Santerre, Alexandre, and Saint-Prix, received during the night a written order through the acting chief of the second legion, to which their battalions belonged, to hold themselves in readiness to march at the first order. This came by order of the general commandant.[89] This commandant of the

been able to find why it is so signed. It is plainly Alexandre's answer to Pétion for he was commandant of Saint-Marcel. He adds a P. S., saying "Perron is with me and we are going to the gathering to disperse them." Perron in his "Procès-verbal" confirms Alexandre's P. S.

[86] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire," 8.

[87] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Perron." As we shall see later he did not convoke all the members.

[88] "Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet, Guiard et Thomas."

[89] "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux I, 407; "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce" in "Pièces justificatives," Nos. II and

Digitized by Google

national guards, who for the month of June was Romainvilliers, was as embarrassed as his subordinates. After Pétion had dismissed the commandants of the faubourgs at one o'clock at night he requested Alexandre to write to the general commandant and inform him of what was occurring in the sections and ask for such instructions as the chief thought suitable. Alexandre dispatched this letter to Romainvilliers by a soldier at four o'clock in the morning. At six o'clock, he received the response which he says was given only after a half-hour's complaint about the difficulty of his position and the hard lot of being wakened at five o'clock when one has retired as late as ten, all good and true principles, Alexandre remarked, but having no application to the circumstances.[90] The commandant's response referred to the law which forbade marching without a written order,[91] and yet as we saw before, Santerre, Alexandre and Saint-Prix had all received instructions at one o'clock this night by his orders to hold themselves ready to march at the first call. Many other officers also had this order. At eight o'clock in the morning the commandant went to the Hôtel de Ville where he had been summoned by the mayor to await precise orders from the municipal corps, Pétion having told him the day before that the case was too serious for him to act without the coöperation of the municipality.[92]

The faubourgs, Saint-Marcel and Saint-Antoine, had been assembled since five o'clock in the morning.[93] At the faubourg

IV, "Addition au rapport que le commandant," No. XXXI, in same; "Rapport de Legard."

[90] "Rapport d'Alexandre," Ternaux I, 407. In this connection Alexandre quotes from Scarron,

"Cette response est bonne et belle,
Mais en enfer de quoi sert-elle?"

[91] Alexandre to Pétion, June 20, 1792. This letter tells Pétion that Alexandre has written to the commandant as he was instructed to do and gives the substance of the commandant's answer. Romainvilliers omits all mention of this information and order from Pétion in his report; "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers" and "Addition au rapport."

[92] "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers" and "Addition au rapport"; "Déclaration de Desmousseaux."

Digitized by Google

Saint-Antoine the decree of the directory had been posted during the night and crowds of people armed and unarmed were angrily commenting upon it. Sergent and Panis, the administrators of police sent out by Pétion, reached this faubourg at about eight o'clock. They were soon recognized and surrounded. They urged the people to lay down their arms, showing them that it was illegal to present a petition in arms. The people assured them that they had no intention of abandoning their arms and that they did not intend to attack the assembly nor the king. They said they had two objects, one to form a procession for the twenty legal petitioners who wished to present a petition to the assembly and to the king, the other to celebrate the anniversary of the oath of the tennis court by planting a maypole in military fashion. Besides they said they feared they would be fired upon at the Tuileries. The committee of the section Quinze-Vingts in this faubourg was in session surrounded by a great crowd of citizens armed and unarmed and with or without uniforms. Here the battalion Enfants-Trouvées was assembled with officers. Santerre was the central figure here and the mayor's letter stating the intention of the directory was the subject of discussion. Panis and Sergent continued their efforts to induce the people to respect the law, but in vain. Santerre, after inviting the administrators of police to go with them, referred the question to the people and they shouted that other armed deputations and battalions had been received by the assembly and that the directory had not opposed them, that the law was the same for all, and that they also would be received. After more vain efforts to execute the law, the officers withdrew and on going into the street saw a part of an armed battalion and a street full of citizens whose spirits were dominated with joy. The maypole, loaded on a wagon, was in their midst. Commissioners of the section and commissioners of police came to join the citizens and a banner inscribed, "In commemoration of the oath of the tennis court," was carried aloft. Sergent and Paris then set out toward the Place de la Bastille where they saw armed citizens continually

[98] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

Digitized by Google

coming from various directions and applauded by the citizens. The administrators of police then entered a café and had breakfast.[94]

In the same faubourg the committee of the neighboring section Montreuil was in session this morning concerting with the police in an attempt to maintain order. A deputation from the section Quinze-Vingts composed of an officer, some soldiers, and some citizens, came in the name of Santerre to invite Bonneau and Savin, commandants of the battalion Sainte-Marguerite to march with their battalion, following that of the Enfants-Trouvées. Bonneau answered them with Pétion's letter which stated the decree of the directory and which appealed to the patriotism of the chiefs as a guarantee that the law would not be violated. The deputation answered that the battalion Enfants-Trouvées had received the same order but represented that it had been revoked. Bonneau did not give credence to this report, but when a great number of citizens and of national guards manifested a desire to march with their friends of the Quinze-Vingts, he yielded because he wished to avoid the evils which would follow a determined resistance. However, he and Savin, his second in command, entered a formal protest to the committee to the effect that they had not violated explicit orders, but had acted by constraint.[95]

In the faubourg Saint-Marcel even more violent scenes were taking place at the same hour and in more than one part of the faubourg. According to instructions received during the night from the chief of their legion and the letter of Pétion received at seven thirty, Saint-Prix and his second in command, Leclerc, arrived early at the headquarters of their battalion, Val-de-Grâce. They found it surrounded by a crowd of armed men who wished to force the volunteers to go with them. The commandants recalled the law and showed the crowd the orders which they had received but protestations, efforts and entreaties were useless.

[94] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent." These men have been criticized by some writers for stopping to eat breakfast. (Ternaux I, 155–56.) But we have seen them on duty all night long so can understand their need.

[95] "Section de Montreuil, Procès-verbal de la protestation de MM. Bonneau et Savin."

Digitized by Google

They were insulted. The crowd tried to take their cannon from them. The commandants asked to put armed men in front of the cannon to protect it, but all was useless. The people were impatient because the hour for joining the faubourg Saint-Antoine was passing. They asked for a drummer but before Saint-Prix could give him orders his own volunteers of the battalion urged the crowd to possess itself of their cannon and, the cannoneers abandoning their pieces, the people did so. Seeing themselves defeated by this act of insubordination on the part of the cannoners, Leclerc and Saint-Prix rushed in front of the crowd, orders in one hand and sword in the other. But realizing that only one adjutant supported them, they recalled the cannoneers to their pieces and yielded to the demands of the crowd. But on the way the two commandants called upon the spectators to witness that they were "forced to march by violence and insubordination."[96]

In another part of the faubourg the committee of the section of the Gobelins was assembled in the basement of the Marché-aux-Chevaux. Perron who had been sent out by Pétion at seven o'clock to engage the citizens to give up their project reached the faubourg soon after. He went to Alexandre, commandant of the battalion Saint-Marcel, who accompanied him to the committee of the section. Perron stated his mission and in company with Alexandre, the president of the committee and a commissioner of police went to the meeting-place on the boulevard Salpêtrière. Here they found a part of the battalion Saint-Marcel with arms and cannon and a large assemblage of men and women with all kinds of arms. After beating a drum to get attention, Alexandre, surrounded by the citizens, stated the object of their mission and then read the letter of the chief of the legion, the letter of the commandant, the letter of the directory and the

[96] "Rapport de ce que s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce," par Saint-Prix; Longchamp, Capt 4" Co., 10" Bat., 2d Legion, to Pétion, June 20, 1792, in Archives Nationales, F^{7}4774^{70}; Weber, *Mémoires,* II, 181, refers to a letter which he says was written by an eye witness and a member of the former States General, which bears out this statement. Weber does not give the author's name.

Digitized by Google

mayor's official message and asked them to listen to the administrator of police. Perron urged the people to obey the laws and tried to induce them to lay down their arms and take the cannon back to the guardhouse, but their murmurs became violent. The people feared that their march would be stopped at the military posts on the way and that they would be repelled by force from the interior of the chateau. Consequently Perron could not shake their resolution to carry out their idea. The people, however, did not appear hostile, but assured him that they had but two objects, the first to pay their respects to the assembly and to the king, the second to renew the oath of the tennis court and to convince him of their good intentions they invited him to march at their head. One of the volunteers said openly to Alexandre, "Sir, you will be forced to march." Seeing that all their efforts were unavailing, Alexandre asked Perron to report what had happened here for the justification of both of them and Perron returned to the municipality.[97] Thorillon, a member of the national assembly and a justice of the peace in the faubourg Saint-Marcel, on hearing of the gathering went to the commandant and to the commissioner of police and finally to the committee of the section. He learned of the people's determination to go in spite of the remonstrance of the administrator of police who reminded them of the law and of the decree of the directory. While the commandant of the battalion was gone to join the other officers the crowd possessed itself of cannon with a view to beginning their march. The committee of the section, despairing because of this disobedience, charged Thorillon with making a report of the situation to the assembly and asking it to execute the law.[98]

At the time of departure the three municipal officers who had been sent out by Pétion at eight-thirty arrived. They had made their way through lines of curious spectators who were watching for the procession. The officers met the procession, preceded by the two cannon, opposite the hospital Saltpêtrière. Soon they were

[97] "Rapport d'Alexandre"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Perron."

[98] *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 264; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 301.

Digitized by Google

surrounded by the crowd of people of all ages, both sexes, armed and unarmed, many in uniform, grenadiers, fusileers and light infantry with the flag in their midst. The officers reminded them of the law, of the orders given them, and of the departmental decree, but the crowd assured them that their intentions were good, that they did not wish to commit any disorder, that they only wished to present their respects to the assembly, to celebrate the oath of the tennis court, and to plant a liberty tree to perpetuate its memory. They said again that the assembly had received other petitioners and they did not see why they should not be received. The officers appealed to them in the name of the country and in the name of humanity to consider the frightful evils which might follow their conduct, but the citizens answered that no one had cause to fear and that they would guarantee that no disorder would be committed, but that nothing could prevent them from marching. The magistrates reminded them that in order to be good officers they were forced to execute the law, whereupon the citizens answered that they recognized this fact and that they also would be good citizens and that if cannon were to be used against them they also must have some. They then asked the officers to carry their flags. Whereupon the crowd yielded to its impatience and cried, "*En avant! monsieur le commandant, en avant!*" and Alexandre gave the order to march. The officers returned to the municipality where they made their report. At the same time, the municipality of Gentilly arrived and asked permission to join the procession.[99]

During all this excitement a crowd had gathered in the neighboring section Jardin des Plantes trying to take away from the commandant of the battalion, Laffond, his cannon. He dispatched two letters to Pétion asking for instructions.[100]

Meanwhile at the Hôtel de Ville the mayor had not been idle. We have seen that when Pétion learned that the directory refused on the 19th to legalize the procession he had great fear of the

[99] "Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet, Guiard et Thomas"; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire." Alexandre in his *Mémoires* says he gave the order to march, Masson, *Petites histoires*, 1. série, 246–58.

[100] Laffond to Pétion, June 20, 1792, in Archives Nationales F[7]4474[70].

Digitized by Google

consequences and so dispatched an order to the commandants of the battalions urging them to obey the decree of the directory. We also saw that he then convoked the municipality for the morning of the 20th and sent several municipal officers and some administrators of police to the faubourgs, but he gave no order to the commandant of the national guard who came to him at eight o'clock in the morning as requested. He kept him waiting until eleven-thirty while the municipality held its session.[101] The attendance was not full. According to the statement of four of the municipal officers, Borie, Desmousseaux, J. J. Leroux and Jallier, they did not receive their summons until nine o'clock and Champion states that he received none at all.[102] When the session opened, Pétion communicated to them the reports that he had received from the administrators of police and the correspondence with the department. He told them that it was not possible to stop the march of so great a crowd of citizens and suggested to them what he said seemed the only reasonable thing to do under the circumstances—to legalize the procession. In order to do this it would be necessary to authorize the battalions to march and to rally the armed citizens in the midst of them and under the command of the chiefs.[103] They then passed the following decree: "The municipal corps being informed that a great number of citizens in all kinds of uniforms and all kinds of arms propose to present themselves to the national assembly and to the king to present an address and to celebrate at the same time the anniversary of the oath of the tennis court, decrees: That the chief of the legion, commandant of the national guard shall immediately give the necessary orders to assemble under the flag citizens in all kinds of uniforms, with all kinds of arms, who will march thus assembled under the command of the officers of the battalions."[104] According to statements of three municipal

[101] "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers"; "Déclaration du sieur Desmousseaux."

[102] "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Borie"; "Déclaration de M. J. J. Leroux," "Déclaration de M. Jallier"; "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Champion"; "Déclaration du sieur Desmousseaux."

[103] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[104] Decree of the municipal corps, June 20, 1792.

Digitized by Google

officers, Borie, Leroux and Jallier, they arrived at the meeting too late to have any part in the adoption of the decree. When Borie expressed his displeasure at seeing the law thus violated Mouchet answered that the circumstances did not permit of any other action.[105] The law of March 27, 1791 forbade the municipality to act contrary to a decree of the directory.[106] After passing this decree, the municipality adjourned and the members were sent by Pétion to the various places where the procession was to pass to see that everything passed off in an orderly manner, especially at the assembly and the château.[107]

The commandant, who had been at the city hall awaiting orders since eight o'clock, received a copy of the decree of the municipal corps at eleven-thirty and returned to the headquarters of the national guard where he found contradictory orders from the minister of the interior and the directory. The minister of the interior wrote to the directory at nine o'clock, "Without delay give orders to the troops to march to the defense of the château." This letter was at once sent to the commandant with an emphatic order from the directory "to lose not an instant" in sending troops to defend the Tuileries. The directory not receiving an answer to this order, because the commandant, as we have seen, was at the Hôtel de Ville, sent another order to the headquarters still more explicit, requiring him, or in his absence, the first officer in service to "lend the help of the national guard or to summon troops of the line to assure by all means possible, even by force of arms, the safety of the king and all the royal family."[108]

The directory of the department sat in continued session on this

[105] "Procès-verbal dressé par Borie."

[106] "Rapport fait au conseil du département par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort," 255. The *Révolutions de Paris* says (XII, 548) that this decree was wiser than that of the directory.

[107] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire"; "Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet et Boucher Saint-Saveur"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Boucher René;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû."

[108] Terrier to the directory, June 20, 1792, nine o'clock, Directory to the commandant, June 20, 1792, nine o'clock; Directory to the *état major*, June 20, 1792, in Ternaux I, 162.

Digitized by Google

morning and kept up constant communication with the minister of the interior, the château and the assembly. The minister of the interior was as much concerned as the directory in the keeping of the peace. He was a man of firmness of character and of royalist sympathies.[109] We saw that he wrote a letter to the directory at half past two on the morning of the 19th and received a reply and that at six o'clock and at seven the directory sent him dispatches. At eight o'clock he wrote to the king rendering him an account of what was happening and assured him that he would come to his assistance.[110] At the same hour he wrote two letters to the directory applauding their action and saying that the king wished that any attempt to enter the château should be resisted.[111] At nine o'clock he dispatched the order which we have seen above to the directory for the commandant and received their reply.[112] At eleven o'clock he again wrote the directory saying that the king desired two members of the department to come to the Tuileries to report the state of the city and to take precautionary measures.[113]

The legislative assembly met about noon on the 20th, but did not turn its attention at first, as might have been expected, to a consideration of the threatened uprising. After some other business had been brought before it, the president announced that the directory of the department wished to be admitted.[114] The directory had shown great interest in trying to prevent the procession and had been in session since four o'clock in the morning, as we have seen, adjourning to attend the assembly as soon as

[109] Mercy to Kaunitz, June 27, 1792, Glagau, *Die französische Legislative*, 339.

[110] Terrier to Louis XVI, June 20, 1792, eight o'clock, in Archives Nationales, C 185.

[111] Terrier to the directory, June 20, 1792, eight o'clock in *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur.*

[112] Terrier to the directory, June 20, 1792, nine o'clock; Directory to Terrier, June 20, 1792, in *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur.*

[113] Terrier to the directory, June 20, 1792, eleven o'clock a. m. in *Revue rétrospective*, 2. série, I, 170.

[114] *Moniteur*, XII, 711; *Journal des débats et décrets*, No. 267, p. 263; *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée nationale*, 376.

Digitized by Google

that body convened.[115] They were admitted at once and Roederer addressed the meeting. He said, "An extraordinary gathering of armed men exists at this moment in spite of the law, in spite of two decrees, one of the commune, the other of the department." He went on to explain that the gathering was composed of persons of various intentions and that it had several objects in view. The object of the great majority of the people, he said, was certainly to plant a liberty tree, to hold a civic fête, and to present a new tribute of its homage to the national assembly, but he thought there was reason to fear that the attempt to present a petition to the king would be supported by force and as armed petitioners they should not be permitted to take such action. He added that reports made during the night justified these fears and that a letter from the minister of the interior at nine o'clock had advised the directory to order out troops at once to defend the château because the latest reports indicated pressing danger. He pleaded for the execution of the decree of the directory and of the wishes of the minister of the interior expressed in his letter. He said the directory felt responsible to the nation for the security of the assembly and of Paris. He again called attention to the law forbidding all armed assemblies and all unarmed ones except by permission of the municipality, and to the law against deputations of more than twenty persons for the purpose of presenting petitions. He said that while today men might be assembled for civic purposes, tomorrow there might assemble malcontents, enemies of the revolution and of the assembly. He asked, "What will we say to them? What obstacle can we put in the way of their gathering? In a word, how can we and the municipality answer for your safety if the law does not furnish the means?" He urged the assembly to uphold the law and not to receive this armed multitude in its midst, and to let nothing diminish its obligation to die for the sake of the public peace.[116]

[115] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 23.

[116] *Moniteur*, XII, 711–12; *Journal des débats et décrets*, No. 267, p. 261; *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée nationale*, 367; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale*, XXI, 296. Roederer cites the last as giving the text of his addresses. I have followed it. *Le patriote français*, No. 1046, p. 689, says

Digitized by Google

There were frequent murmurs from the galleries during this address especially when the good intentions of the people were called into question. There was little applause.

The president, François de Nantes, after quieting the galleries said, "The national assembly will take into consideration the account that you have submitted to it. It invites you to attend its session." The directory then entered the hall amidst murmurs of the galleries and applause of a part of the assembly.[117]

The conduct of the Girondins in the assembly at this time shows decided sympathy with the uprising. Vergniaud was the first speaker. He said he agreed with Roederer that civism alone actuated the citizens, but that the assembly ought to take the precautions that prudence commanded in order to prevent any act that might be provoked by the ill-intentioned. He thought it would be more regular if both they and the constituent assembly had conformed to the principles that forbade the introduction of an armed force into the legislative body because, even if civism brought men here today, tomorrow the ill-intentioned might bring in soldiers; that the sanctuary of the law ought to be open only to legislators; that by following the example of the constitutent assembly they had been abettors of irregular conduct of the citizens and having accorded this permission to other delegations they ought not to be astonished at this request. He said, however, that the position here was a critical one because while other armed gatherings had been formed without asking permission of the administrative bodies, this one had done so. He thought prudence would not allow them to assume bad intentions on the part of the people and that having once accorded the privilege of marching through the hall they could not refuse it now. He did not think that the citizens intended to send armed petitioners to the king and while he did not believe that there was any danger

that without doubt Roederer was fulfilling his duty by this address rather than expressing his opinion.

[117] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 296–98. This paper is called the most exact and the most complete journal of the national assembly, Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 24, note; Hatin, *Bibliographie de la presse périodique française.*

Digitized by Google

he said, if there was, the assembly should share it and so asked for a deputation of sixty members to be sent to the king to remain till the gathering was dispersed.[118]

Gilbert then said that he had no doubt that the greater part of the citizens were well meaning but said the fact that they had not obeyed Pétion whose patriotism and influence were well known and who had made every effort this morning to disperse the gathering, proved that there were ill-intentioned ones among them.[119] He supported Vergniaud's motion.[120]

Thorillon then reported what has already been noted above as having occurred that morning in the section of the Gobelins. His speech brought out the fact that the people marched in spite of the protestations of the police and dragged cannon with them.[121]

Dumolard rendered justice to the purity of the sentiments which animated the citizens and said he was far from believing that the majority of them had criminal intentions. But he thought that in these critical circumstances the best of citizens might become instruments of intrigues and manœuvers with which the assembly was besieged every day. He said the time had come when they ought to place the constitution upon the respect-

[118] The points in this speech are supported by three daily newspapers, *Moniteur,* XII, 714; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 299; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 263; Three other dailies support a few of the points, all agreeing upon Vergniaud's defense of the citizens' good intentions and his request for a deputation to be sent to the king. *Chronique de Paris,* No. 174, p. 690; *Le patriote français,* No. 1046, p. 690; *Annales patriotiques et littéraires,* No. 173, p. 760; *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée nationale,* 376, says Vergniaud asked that the citizens should present themselves before the assembly and the king unarmed and that he asked for the deputation to the king.

[119] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 300; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 264; *Moniteur,* XII, 715.

[120] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale* is the only paper making this direct statement, but Gilbert's speech is plainly meant to show the importance of Vergniaud's motion.

[121] *Ibid.,* XXI, 351; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 264; The *Moniteur* does not give Thorillon's report of what occurred in the faubourg but says the crowd refused to obey the police and dragged cannon.

Digitized by Google

able basis of the peace and prosperity of the empire; that the time had come when they ought to execute the law in order to teach the constituted authorities to execute it. He said he understood how the national assembly, led by the example of its predecessors, had up to this time received deputations of armed men in its midst, but that the law which forbade this existed none the less and that past infractions could not justify future infractions. He reminded the assembly that at the beginning of its sessions it had felt that it would be dangerous to admit not only armed deputations but too large a number of unarmed men and for that reason had passed a decree limiting the number to ten. This decree ought to be rigorously executed and it could not be if the ten unarmed persons presenting themselves at the bar should be supported by several thousand armed men outside. He asked them to remember that all France had its eyes turned upon them and that ill-intentioned persons might easily misinterpret their conduct. "If," he continued, "in spite of the decrees of the department and of the municipality, in spite of laws most formal and most holy, in spite of the excitement and the disorder which reigns in a misled multitude, they should penetrate into our midst and into the château, it will be concluded that neither the assembly nor the king are free. This imputation would be injurious to the citizens of Paris. It is important to silence calumniators. It is important to show to our fellow citizens that the intrigues of aristocrats and of anarchists are equally powerless; that the constitution will not perish by their efforts, but will triumph over all of its enemies." He said he was far from resenting the motion of Vergniaud, that on the contrary it appeared essential, since it would show a union which ought to exist between the two powers for the welfare of the country. It is more essential still to show to all Europe that the assembly is not the dupe of a faction that wishes to destroy the constitution and liberty. He then asked, first that Vergniaud's motion be put to vote and, second that the department of Paris be asked to report at the evening session the measures it had taken to execute the law. This speech was very often interrupted by murmurs or applause and at the close both were violent. Many

Digitized by Google

members at once sprang to their feet demanding recognition, but at this point the president interrupted the debate by announcing a letter from Santerre, commandant of one of the battalions of the faubourg Saint-Antoine. A scene of confusion followed in which applause, murmurs and cries within mingled with the commotion from without. The procession had reached the vicinity of the assembly and was demanding admittance.[122]

We have seen that the two faubourgs, Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marcel, began to gather at five o'clock in the morning, one on the boulevard Salpêtrière and the other near the Bastille, and that they were joined by cannoneers, grenadiers, officers from the sections and commissioners of police; that they determined to persist in their purpose of marching to the assembly in spite of the efforts of the municipal officers to disperse them. We saw, too, that Alexandre gave the command to march to the assembled crowd in the faubourg Saint-Marcel, which proceeded to join the inhabitants of the faubourg Saint-Antoine. Alexandre tells us that just at the moment of starting, he received the decree of the municipal corps which permitted the citizens in any dress and with any kind of arms to march under the command of the officers of the battalion. He says that the decree relieved him of an enormous burden and that under the circumstances he regarded it as a great benefit.[123] The two faubourgs were separated by the Seine and it was necessary to cross either by means of ferry boats at the place where the present Austerlitz bridge stands or farther on at the Ile Saint-Louis by the Tournelle and Marie bridges, or passage might be made even farther down the river by the bridges of the Cité. These last, Alexandre tells us in his *Mémoires,* were guarded by troops under orders from the court. He decided to cross by way of the Ile Saint-Louis and to his great astonishment he arrived without obstacle in the midst of the faubourg Saint-Antoine where he effected a juncture with the battalions that awaited him.[124] The juncture was effected without

[122] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 301–13; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 264–65; *Moniteur,* XII, 715.

[123] "Rapport d'Alexandre."

[124] "Mémoires d'Alexandre."

Digitized by Google

accident on the site of the Bastille and the united column set out directing its march toward the national assembly.[125] The procession marched under orders from Santerre, "who," as Alexandre said, "was my senior and whose second I became."[126]

Alexandre continues, "The route was long, but every thing passed off in an orderly way. No one was insulted and almost everywhere people showed signs of joy and satisfaction by applause and repeated acclamations."[127] The line of march followed the rue Saint-Antoine to the Place Bandoyer, thence by the rue Marché Saint-Jean it reached the direct line of the rue de la Verrèrie and the rue des Lombards. From this point by the rue de la Ferronnèrie, it entered the rue Saint-Honoré which it followed up to a point where a cross street led to the Place Vendôme. On the left was the monastery of the Feuillants. Here it halted.[128]

The grounds and buildings in this vicinity have been much changed since 1792. Then the space between the garden of the Tuileries and the rue Saint-Honoré was irregularly covered by the buildings, courts and passages of the monastery of the Feuillants. Today the rue de Rivoli occupies the part of this space bordering on the garden of the Tuileries and is separated from it by a grating. A cross street, Castiglione, leading from this grating to the Place Vendôme has also been cut out of this space. The part of the rue de Rivoli from the former site of the Tuileries to the rue Castiglione formed then the court of the *manège*. This court was separated from the terrace of the Feuillants by a wall now replaced by the grating. Thus it will be seen that the

[125] Rapport d'Alexandre."

[126] "Mémoires d'Alexandre" It will be noted that for this incident—the juncture of the two faubourgs—we have only the accounts of Alexandre. In the "Rapport" he gives only the general statement of the union being effected without accident and of the procession starting out toward the assembly. In the "Mémoires," he gives more details.

[127] "Rapport d'Alexandre."

[128] "Rapport" and "Mémoires" of Alexandre. In the "Rapport" Alexandre states that he received the decree of the municipality just as the procession started but in the "Mémoires" he says he received it when they reached the rue Saint-Honoré.

Digitized by Google

manège and its court extended between the terrace of the Feuillants and the garden of the Tuileries.

The *manège* which had been appropriated for the use of the constitutional assembly when it was transferred from Versailles to Paris in 1789, was a building about one hundred fifty feet long standing parallel to the terrace of the Feuillants. Its long, narrow court served as an avenue. It was this court through which the procession would have to pass in order to reach the château. The entrance to the *manège* could be effected at either end of the building, but in order to get the procession out of the end leading to the château it must enter the end toward the Feuillants. Since the château was the objective point, it is clear why the leaders brought the procession up the rue Saint-Honoré as far as the Feuillants. Here they could pass between the buildings of the Feuillants and those of the Capucins which stood next to them. The courts and the gardens of these two monasteries opened into each other.[129] About the time that the procession arrived at the Feuillants by the rue Saint-Honoré, two municipal officers whom Pétion had sent to the vicinity of the Tuileries, Mouchet and Boucher-Saint-Sauveur, learning that the cortege was in the rue Saint-Honoré, proceeded to its head. They described it as being headed by sappers, national guards and cannon and dragging with it the wagon upon which the liberty tree was placed. They asked the citizens what they intended to do. They received answer that they were going to the national assembly. When the officers told them that they could not legally enter in such great numbers, they answered that they were going to ask permission and the officers accompanied the leaders to the assembly door.[130]

The procession as it reached the rue Saint-Honoré is thus described by an eyewitness who wrote, almost at the time, for a contemporary newspaper:

"The faubourgs assembled upon the site of the Bastille, set out in good order about ten o'clock, the tables of the rights of man at their head,

[129] See map of Paris in 1792, Brette, *Histoire des édifices où ont siégé les assemblées;* Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 33.

[130] Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet et Boucher Saint-Sauveur.

Digitized by Google

placed between several pieces of cannon. They showed the same honors to the liberty tree which they proposed to set up in the garden of the Tuileries opposite the château. Various inscriptions were borne aloft in the procession, none of which announced any dark designs of brigands. Here could be read, 'The nation, the law.' 'When the country is in danger all the sans-culottes are aroused,' 'Long live the national assembly,' 'Warning to Louis XVI, The people, weary of suffering, wish entire liberty or death,' 'We wish only union, liberty, long live equality,' 'Free and sans-culottes, we will preserve at least the fragments,' 'People and national guards, we are only one, we wish to be only one.' When it arrived at the rue Saint Honoré the procession, which had grown at each step, was truly imposing and solemn. This crowd of people of all conditions and in all kinds of costumes, armed as they had been in July, 1789, with every weapon that came to their hands, marched in a disorder which was only apparent. This was not a mob; these were the people of the first city of the world, full of the sentiment of liberty and filled at the same time with respect for the law which they had made. Touching fraternal feeling and equality alone honored this fête in which were found pellmell, locking arms with each other, national guards with their uniforms and without, more than two hundred of the oldest of the *invalides,* a great number of women and children of all ages, and very few epaulets; but red caps, all the charcoal burners and all the market porters in fine feather. Among the arms of all kinds with which this mass of men bristled, were seen great boughs, bouquets of flowers and ears of corn. An unrestrained joy animated this picture and passed into the hearts of the onlookers."[181]

It was thus that the people arrived at the court of the Feuillants at half past one o'clock and asked permission, through their leader, Santerre, to enter the assembly. As has already been said, the president interrupted the discussion to announce a letter which he had received from the commandant of the faubourg Saint-Antoine, dated June 20, 1792, and which read as follows:

"Mr. President, The inhabitants of the faubourg Saint-Antoine are celebrating today the anniversary of the oath of the tennis court; they come to present their homage to the national assembly. Their intentions have been calumniated; they ask the honor of being admitted today at the

[181] *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 548–50, dated June 16–23, 1792. A similar description is found in *Courrier des 83 départements,* IX, written by one who claims to have been an eye witness. This account is reprinted in a pamphlet called, *Récit général.* Another briefer and evidently prejudiced account, by one who says he saw the procession is found in *Correspondance politique,* LXIII, 3.

Digitized by Google

bar; they will a second time confound their cowardly detractors, they will prove today that they are the friends of law and of liberty, the men of the 14th of July. I am with respect, Mr. President, your very humble and very obedient servant. Santerre, commandant of battalion."[122]

The reading of this letter called forth much applause from the assembly and the galleries. There was great excitement, and amidst applause, murmurs and cries, Lasource finally got the floor. He said that he had some information that would quiet their fears; that the orator of the citizens had just been in one of the offices of the assembly and had asked him to say to the assembly that they had no other object than to present their respectful homage; that they asked to march before them; that in truth they had an address to present to the king but that they did not intend to go to the château; that they wished to leave this address on the desk of the assembly for it to make use of as it saw fit and that they would make a formal agreement not to go to the château.

Vergniaud spoke next. He said he shared the opinion of Dumolard that the constitution ought to be put upon a firm basis and the laws executed. He thought, if the people had violated the law, it was because both the constituent and the present assembly had favored such a violation by allowing similar gatherings; that if they ordered the directory and the municipality to execute the law rigorously they would be renewing the bloody scenes of the Champ-de-Mars. Here were heard applause from the galleries and murmurs from one side of the house. He continued, "If you take this action which is not in your hearts, the assembly will place an ineffaceable blot upon its history." [Applause from the galleries.] Again he pleaded precedent for the error of the citizens and said that they could not believe that they would be denied admission. He insisted that since they had been assured of the purity of the motives of the citizens they could not refuse them because—and this, he said, was a very important point—"the people have been justly restless and they wish to prove to you that whatever intrigue or manœuver may be used to frighten

[122] Ternaux I, 169; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 303; *Récit général,* 10.

Digitized by Google

you about their object, the inhabitants of the faubourg Saint-Antoine will always be the firmest defenders of the law." He then asked that these petitioners already assembled be allowed to pass through their midst, but asked the assembly to pass a decree prohibiting all future admission of armed men. He closed with the applause of the galleries and a part of the assembly.[183]

Then there was a real tumult in which some members called for the question, others tried to get the floor and others accused the president of unfairness in wishing to close the discussion.

Ramond, member of the Right, was allowed by a vote of the assembly to speak. He said Vergniaud had alleged justly that, having up to the present time admitted armed men to march before it, the assembly could not now refuse those who asked the same favor, but that he had omitted one essential difference between the present case and former ones. He said that up to the present time no one had warned the citizens that they were breaking the law, that no constituted authority had shown them their error and so they had not violated a law of the realm and that this case was essentially different. Here murmurs were heard. But he continued that he thought better of the dispositions of the citizens than Vergniaud did and having mingled with them since the beginning of the revolution he had a right to speak of their intentions. He said that when Vergniaud feared that the execution of the law would cause bloodshed he did not know to what degree the respect for law was graven on the hearts of all the citizens.[184]

Here the president interrupted the discussion and announced that the commandant of the national guard had informed him that the petitioners to the number of eight thousand were at the door and asked to be admitted. In the tumult which this occasioned, Calvet cried, "They are eight thousand and we are only seven

[183] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 304; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 265; *Moniteur,* XII, 715. All the points in these two speeches are supported by these three papers except the last point in Vergniaud's speech which is not made clear in the *Journal de l'assemblée nationale.*

[184] *Ibid.*

Digitized by Google

hundred and forty-five; I propose that we suspend the session and go out."[135] This caused a still greater tumult and several members spoke at once. There were cries for Ramond to continue, for Calvet to be called to order. It was said that it would be cowardly to adjourn and finally the president called Calvet to order and quiet was reëstablished. Ramond then replied to Calvet, saying, "Eight thousand men await at your door your decision; twenty-five millions await it no less."[136] He then continued his speech. He said that more than any one he believed in the respect citizens have for the law; he believed that the legislative body would fail in its most sacred duty if it did not warn them of the respect they owed to the constituted authorities; that the legislative body was not only the lawmaker but the teacher of the people; that it ought not only to watch over the constituted authorities, but over the citizens who constituted them; and that it owed it to the law, which is the divinity of a free people, to warn them that they were transgressing a law which they had promulgated. He said he did not fear to see the entire people around them and that the more there were, the more opinions would be enlightened by the expression of the public wish; that no one desired more than he to see the citizens pass before them and to see the display of arms which would frighten their enemies, but that the assembly ought to demand that those arms be deposited at the door, else their act would take on the character of fear. [Applause and murmurs.] He said he applauded the generous sentiment which actuated Vergniaud's motion to send sixty members to the Tuileries but, convinced that there was no cause for fear in the midst of the people of Paris, he called for the previous question. But he asked that the legislative body, faithful to its duty, present to the empire and to all Europe the spectacle of an obedient multitude. He then insisted on his demand that the citizens deposit their arms at the door before they entered. [Murmurs in the galleries and, from the Left, some applause.]

[135] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 305; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268; p. 267; The *Moniteur* gives the same thought in different words.

[136] *Ibid.*

Digitized by Google

Gaudet took the floor. He said that when the sections of Paris had before presented themselves armed and had asked the honor of marching through the hall they had each time been accorded the favor; on this day the citizens of the faubourg Saint-Antoine asked the same favor [interruption] but suddenly it was discovered that this was a violation of the law and the demand was made that this seditious gathering be repressed with all the rigor of the law. (Several voices cried, "Not true, not true.") He said that it seemed to him that in the minds of these gentlemen the opinion of Dumolard did not deserve to be refuted, but that he thought it did. He went on to say that the demand of Ramond to deposit their arms was absolutely impractical and based upon what? A violation of the decree of the directory of the department of Paris. How could they speak of a decree of the directory, when they knew that a former law of the nation forbids the march in arms, and that the assembly has already permitted such processions. [Applause from the galleries.] It would be a revolting injustice to refuse them. He said this measure resembled that of a Roman emperor who had the laws written in such small letters that the citizens could not read them that he might find many occasions for punishment. Here there was violent agitation among the members and applause in the galleries. Some cried to call Gaudet to order; others called for Ramond's motion, and one member shouted that those who had brought the citizens here could not well send them away, but Gaudet added that the assembly had led the citizens into error and had deceived them and so he demanded the admission of the petitioners. Many voices called for the question and the galleries applauded wildly. The assembly closed the discussion.[137]

During the debate the procession, led by Santerre, Alexandre and Saint-Huruge, was waiting outside. It had approached the *manège* through the rue Saint-Honoré, going as far as the gate of the Feuillants. There it passed into the narrow court of the *manège* to the foot of the stairway leading to the hall of the

[137] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 307–10; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 267–69; *Moniteur,* XII, 716.

Digitized by Google

assembly. The court was separated from the terrace of the Feuillants (also known as the terrace of the Tuileries) by a wall in which there was a gate.[138] This gate, leading to the garden of the Tuileries, had been closed this morning by orders from the château and was guarded by a detachment sent by Mandat of the fourth legion with three pieces of cannon.[139] The procession, led by soldiers, had intended to pass through the gate and plant the maypole on the terrace of the Feuillants, but on finding it shut and guarded, that part of the crowd which had charge of the wagon carrying the poplar tree entered the garden of the Capucins nearby and amused themselves by planting the tree there.[140] At the same time, the crowd in the passage leading to the terrace of the Feuillants increased to the point of suffocation. Not only was this gate closed but the one leading to the assembly was also closed and guarded. The head of the column being thus checked in the passage and the crowd from behind constantly moving up, the pressure became intolerable. The aspect of the cannon pointed at the gate from within, the fact of the gate being ordered closed when it was ordinarily open, and the terrible pressure

[138] "Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet et Boucher Saint-Sauveur;" Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 35.

[139] "Copie du rapport du chef de la quatrième lègion" [Mandat].

[140] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 35; "Déclaration de Lareynie"; *Récit générale*, 9. This pamphlet is an extract from the *Courrier des 83 départements*, IX, by Gorsas. He says he saw the procession. He makes an explanation of why the liberty tree was planted in the garden of the Capucins. He says it was Santerre's request not to plant it on the terrace of the Tuileries, because he feared disorder would result, and that he also dissuaded the people from firing a cannon to announce the planting and that finally they consented to plant it in the court of the Capucins. Lareynie in his declaration made before the judge of the peace of the section Roi de Sicile, explains that the people themselves feared that they would be fired upon in the garden of the Feuillants or the Tuileries and gave this as a reason to Santerre for planting the maypole in the garden of the Capucins. Roederer sees in this planting of the tree in the garden of the Capucins, a proof of the lack of plan, of an object, of a leader and an absence of all understanding among the participants. He believes that the designing men in the crowd hoped that an assassin would be found among them who would attack the king.

Digitized by Google

caused by the ever-increasing crowd aroused the head of the column to a state of fury and they struck violent blows at the gate, determined to break it down.[141]

Three municipal officers, Boucher-René, Boucher-Saint-Sauveur and Mouchet, who had been sent to the château by the mayor, were in the garden of the Tuileries at this time and seeing the danger from the press and hearing the blows and threats of breaking the gate, rushed to the head of the procession to calm the crowd. The people asked the officers to open the gate. They replied that they could not give orders to the château, but they would go there and try to get an order to have the gate opened. They first asked a commandant on the terrace who in turn directed them to the general commandant. But just at this time the noise redoubled and the officers saw that a cannon had been placed before the gate and directed against the citizens. They succeeded in having the cannon withdrawn. They asked the people to be patient until they returned and went to the Tuileries. On reaching the château, they asked for Romainvilliers, the commandant of the national guard, but he could not be found. They then called for M. de Wittinghof, commandant at the Tuileries. They were shown into the apartments where they said they saw a large number of people clothed in black. These men, whose presence and manner were mysterious and therefore a source of irritation and suspicion, were the king's personal guards. The king sent them away before the crowd entered to avoid serious trouble.[142] The king appeared. He asked what the situation in Paris was. Boucher-René re-

[141] "Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet et Boucher Saint-Sauveur"; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 35; "Copie du rapport du chef de la quatrième légion" [Mandat].

[142] Poullenot to Pétion, June 23, 1792, Archives nationales F⁷4774; Addition to "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Déclaration de Jaladon" says they came to him to ask for more guards for the king's apartment; *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* XII, 9, says there were 150 of them ready to form a rampart with their bodies for the king. According to this newspaper the king feared a renewal of the scenes of the 20th of February and to prevent it, sent them away. This same statement is made by Bourcet, (*Révolution française,* XVII, 74). See also Klinckowström, II, 307.

Digitized by Google

plied that the object of the procession was to celebrate the anniversary of the oath of the tennis court and to present a petition to the assembly and to his majesty. The king seemed astonished that the magistrate should see so simple an act in this extraordinary movement and recalled the decree of the council and that of the directory. Then Mouchet reviewed the efforts that they had made since five o'clock to check the uprising and assured the king that since they were not able to prevent the procession they thought it best to legalize it and assemble the people under the flag; that the municipality had also taken the precaution to send its members to various places as seemed necessary and that they three were especially charged with the château. He said it was with great anxiety that they had noticed that the Tuileries, usually open to the public, had been closed just as the cortege arrived and that the people in the narrow passage showed discontent at this. He urged the king to open the gate saying that the cannon pointed at the people tended more to irritate than to appease them. "Your duty," said the king, "is to execute the law." Mouchet insisted that if the gate of the terrace of the Feuillants was not opened it would be forced. The king then replied, "You ought to execute the law. Come to an understanding with the commandant of the national guard; if you think necessary have the gate of the terrace of the Feuillants opened so that the citizens may pass along the terrace and go out by the court of the *écuries*. See that the public peace is not violated; your duty imposes surveillance upon you." The officers rushed to carry the order to Aclocq who was in command of the troops but by the time they reached the gate it had been forced and the crowd had filled the garden of the Tuileries.[148] Whether the gate was forced open

[148] "Procès-verbal dressé par MM. Mouchet et Boucher-Saint-Sauveur;" "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Boucher-René;" "Rapport du chef de la deuxième legion" [Aclocq]; "Déclaration de M. Genty, premier valet de garde-robe du roi," in Ternaux, I, 404; Terrier to the directory, report of June 26, 1792. These last two give the text of the king's order. Roederer (36) thinks that Mouchet represented the mass of the bourgeoisie of Paris who feared the popular fury but who feared even more the royal treason and so would use the uprising of the proletariat to force the court to greater uprightness and fidelity.

Digitized by Google

by a beam from the railing or whether it yielded to the pressure of the crowd can not be affirmed.[144]

While the passage from the Feuillants to the Tuileries was being forced by one part of the crowd and while a second had relieved the pressure by entering the garden of the Capucins, a third part was awaiting, at the door of the assembly, the end of the discussion on the question of admitting them. As Gaudet finished his speech many members were on their feet asking for recognition. Suddenly, a deputation appeared at the bar and the tumult was redoubled. The president put on his hat and the deputation retired. He explained to the assembly that this precipitate entrance was a mistake made in a moment of extreme agitation and said he would put the question of admission to a vote. Lacroix then explained that the mistake was made by an usher and that when the deputation discovered its error it retired. He moved that the question be put to vote and the assembly amidst applause of the galleries and one side, voted to admit the deputation bearing the petition.[145] It was now about two o'clock in the afternoon.[146]

When the column in the court of the Feuillants received permission to march through the assembly hall, the leaders recalled the crowds that had entered the garden of the Capucins and the garden of the Tuileries.

The deputation was led by Huguenin as its orator, who read a long and energetic petition which had been prepared, as we have seen, at the faubourg Saint-Antoine.[147] The presentation of this

[144] J. J. Leroux says it was forced by a beam, but the other witnesses do not say how it was opened.

[145] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 310; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 269; *Moniteur,* XII, 716; The *Gazette de France,* No. 86, a daily newspaper, stated, June 21, 1792, that the necessity of the circumstances (*i. e.,* armed citizens at the door) was responsible for the assembly's rejection of Roederer's view as well as the fact of the majority's real feelings on the matter.

[146] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 30.

[147] *Ibid.,* 30. Roederer gives the name Huguenin. Azema (*Révolution française,* XXVII, 172), gives Enguenet and Lenguenet but no other sources give the name of this orator. Roederer says he was a man with-

Digitized by Google

petition to the national assembly was one of the avowed objects of this day's uprising. A careful examination of its contents may serve to throw some light upon the movement. "Legislators," began the orator, "the French people come today to present to you their fears and their anxieties. In your midst they put aside their alarms and hope to find the remedy for their ills."

He then referred to the oath of the tennis court taken on this memorable day when the representatives swore not to abandon the people's cause and asked the assembly not to abandon this afflicted people. He said the people were stirred and were ready to employ rigorous measures to avenge their outraged majesty and that they found their justification in article two of the declaration of the rights of man—resistance to oppression. "But what a misfortune for free men who have transmitted all their powers to you to see themselves reduced to the cruel necessity of washing their hands in the blood of conspirators. There is no more time to dissimulate: the plot is discovered; the hour has arrived. Blood will flow or the tree of liberty which we are going to plant will flourish in peace."

He asked if the enemies of the country imagined that the men of the 14th of July were asleep. If so, their awakening would be terrible, for the immortal declaration of the rights of man was too profoundly graven on their hearts.

He insisted that it was time to put article two into execution. He called upon them to imitate Cicero, who in open senate exposed the perfidious machinations of Catiline. "You have men animated with the sacred fire of patriotism: let them speak and let us act." He said they had always believed that their union was their strength and that union should exist essentially among the legislators, that when discussing the interests of the state the legislator's heart should be single to it and inaccessible to any individual interest. "Will this image of the country—the only

out talent and without ideas. Neither is it certain who drew the petition up. *L'indicateur,* No. XXXIII, a daily newspaper of the time, stated in the issue of June 21, 1792, that Lasource in concert with Brissot drew it up but it offered no proof and as we have seen above there is no other evidence connecting these men with the movement.

Digitized by Google

divinity that he is permitted to worship—find in its temple, those rebellious to its cult? Let them name themselves the friends of arbitrary power. Let them purge the earth of liberty. Let them go to Coblenz to join the *émigrés*. . . . There they can plot without regrets; there they will conspire against their country which will never fear."

These, he said, were the words Cicero spoke when he pressed the traitor Catiline to join the camp of traitors to the country. He urged the assembly to execute the constitution and wish of the people who perish in their defense. He said it was time for the French people to show themselves worthy of the character that they had assumed, that they had broken down prejudice and intended to remain free, intended to deliver themselves from tyrants leagued against them. Then he added, "You know the tyrants. Do not yield before them."

After these preliminaries of a general nature, three causes for complaint can be clearly distinguished: first, the dismissal of the patriotic ministers; second, the inaction of the armies and their progressive destruction; third, the inaction of the high national courts.

Speaking of the dismissal of the ministers, he said, "The executive power is not in accord with you. We wish no other proof than the dismissal of the patriotic ministers. Does the welfare of a free people depend upon the caprice of a king?" He added, "We complain of the inaction of our armies. We ask that you seek the cause. If it comes from the executive power, let it be annihilated. The blood of patriots ought not to flow to satisfy the pride and ambition of the perfidious château of the Tuileries. . . . Shall we see our armies perish gradually? . . . If the executive power does not act there is but one alternative; you should assume it; one man alone ought not to influence the will of twenty-five million men. . . . We complain, finally, of the delays of the high national court. You have given it the sword of the law. Why does it delay in making it fall upon the head of criminals? . . . The people were forced at the crisis of July 14 to take this sword into their own hands and avenge with one blow the outraged law and punish the criminals." He asked

Digitized by Google

for the permanence of the armies until the constitution should be carried into effect. He closed by saying, "This petition is not only that of the inhabitants of the faubourg Saint-Antoine, but of all sections of the capital and of the environs of Paris. The petitioners ask the honor of marching before you."[148]

The reading of this petition, which has been called "a veritable declaration of war on royalty,"[149] was frequently interrupted by applause and at the close there was applause from the galleries and members attempted to speak, but the president, Française de Nantes, responded: "Citizens, the national assembly and the people are one; we desire your interests, your welfare and your liberty, but we also desire the law and the constitution. The representatives of twenty-four million men assure you through me that we will baffle the plots of conspirators, that we will deliver ourselves to the sword of the law, but that the laws alone have the right to avenge the nation and that it is only in them that you will find the constitution and the liberty that you seek. The assembly invites you in the name of respect for the laws and the administrative bodies, in the name of the country and of liberty, which we cherish and which we have resolved to defend at the peril of our lives, . . . to attend its session."[150] The petitioners crossed the hall amid applause of the galleries and a part of the assembly.

It was now a question of admitting the procession. Dubayet tried to get the floor, but the assembly refused to hear him. The president tried several times to put the question, but there were protests from members who did not wish to admit the crowd. Finally Dumas said, "Out of respect for our oath and for the

[148] The identical text of this petition is found in the Moniteur, XII, 717, *Révolutions de Paris,* XII, 550–52, *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 310–14, and *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 269.

[149] Ternaux, I, 180.

[150] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 314; *Moniteur,* XII, 717. The *Journal des débats et décrets* is not quite so full as the first two. It also mentions interruptions by some members who did not want the deputation admitted. But since the first two named are daily newspapers and therefore probably independent and agree in the fuller account, I have followed them.

Digitized by Google

honor of the national assembly, I ask for the previous question upon the admission of armed citizens." The assembly voted that the citizens of the faubourgs Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marcel be allowed to cross the hall. "Very well then," cried Girardin, "I ask for the previous question on all the laws of the realm."[151]

But the assembly seemed to blow hot and cold with the same breath; while it admitted the procession, it expressed its disapproval of illegal acts. For now another deputation of two battalions from the department of the Gironde, called to the frontier for the defense of the country, presented itself, and being admitted to the assembly read a petition which has been called "the petition of order."[152] It made no attack upon the executive, but presented its homage to the assembly. It expressed satisfaction that the time had arrived when it could prove its courage and fidelity, adding, "Life is not the greatest sacrifice for free men." Here the assembly applauded. The orator continued, "Our oaths are dearer than life; they are based upon the noblest sentiments that can animate the human heart, the love of country and of law. That which we will never forget is that the laws ought always to be present in our memories and dear to our hearts; that the *military force is essentially obedient* [great applause]; that whatever our rank none of us should question our order before obeying it [applause]; that in a free country every citizen from the soldier to the general ought to march straight to the enemy without looking backward." [Renewed applause.] The assembly voted that this discourse should be printed, that it should receive honorable mention in the *procès-verbal* and that copies be sent to the eighty-three departments. Montant humorously suggested that a copy be sent to Lafayette.[153]

The sound of drums and music announced the arrival of the

---

[151] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 315; *Moniteur,* XII, 717; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 272.

[152] Louis Blanc, VIII, 60.

[153] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 316; *Moniteur,* XII, 718; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 273. Montant's name is given in the *Moniteur* and in *Le patriote français,* No. 1046, p. 690 but not in the other papers.

Digitized by Google

procession. The demonstrators entered, preceded by military music. Santerre and Saint-Huruge directed their march and they crossed the hall to the tune of *Ça ira.*[154] *Le mercure universel,* June 21, 1792, gives the following description of the procession as it marched through the assembly:

"The petitioners marched; women, children, wearing liberty caps and carrying branches of trees, tricolored ribbons and a banner upon which was written: 'Tyrants, you dare to drive out our pikes, return to the law or tremble.' There followed grenadiers, armed national guards, citizens with pikes, women with sabers; all were intermingled, fraternally united, presenting only a mass of citizens. In the midst of these imposing groups two tables of the form of those of Mount Sinai were religiously supported; on these was written the sublime declaration of rights. The cries of 'Liberty,' the emblems, the caps, the ribbons, and these inscriptions a thousand times repeated: 'The constitution! Live free or die! The constitution or death!,' the green branches, flowers, applause redoubled without ceasing, the noise of military music, all presented a sort of rare spectacle, where one part of the people dared to reclaim its rights against those who constitutionally wished to enslave it. We shall not speak of numerous and varied groups of women, children, grenadiers, market porters, charcoal burners, priests with swords and guns, and *invalides.* We shall say less still of singular caricatures such as *sans-culottes* held aloft on pikes. Nor shall we speak of the caprice of arms; we saw long and very long pikes, forks, scythes, axes, clubs, great saws, large daggers, etc. But let us say that the flags of various sections and this forest of pikes and bayonets which filled the hall presented a singularity very shocking for some people and less disagreeable for others. A great banner, the ribbons held in women's hands, contained these words: 'Liberty! Tyrants, tremble; the French are armed!' On the other side was written 'Equality. Reunion of the Faubourgs Saint-Antoine and Saint-Marceau.' Another banner bore these words: 'When the country is in danger, all the *sans-culottes* are alert.' And on the other side you read: 'Tremble tyrants, your reign approaches its end.'"[155]

As they moved on, some danced, some shouted, "Long live the patriots! long live the *sans-culottes!* down with the veto!" In the procession there were carried two emblems, one a pair of old knee breeches with the inscription, "Long live the *sans-culottes,*"

[154] *Ibid.*

[155] *Le mercure universal,* June 21, 1792.

Digitized by Google

and the other a heart of a calf, marked, "The heart of an aristocrat."[156]

The procession, which has been estimated at twenty thousand people, occupied about one hour and a half in passing, entering by the door of the Feuillants and going out by the court of the *manège* at the other end of the building.[157] When it had passed, Santerre returned to the bar of the assembly and said that the citizens of the faubourg Saint-Antoine offered their lives for the defense of the country and presented a flag as a mark of appreciation of the kindness shown them. The president accepted it and the assembly adjourned at half past three o'clock.[158]

On learning of the march of the multitude, measures were taken by the commandant to guard the château. A number of battalions arrived at the Tuileries about one o'clock. Ten were placed in the garden upon the terrace before the château, two upon the terrace on the side of the river, five upon the Place du Carrousel, one guarding the gate to prevent entrance there, and four upon the Place Louis XV to guard the orangery. Inside was one battalion, the guard going off duty and the one relieving, and one hundred gendarmes.[159]

---

[156] *Moniteur,* XII, 718; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 317; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 274; a spectator in the galleries wrote that this was a most impressive scene, that every one stood up and that the people showed a true majesty, *Journal d'une bourgeoise,* June 20, 1792.

[157] Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 35; *Lettre de Ph-Ch-Ai Goupilleau, député de la Vendée,* Paris, June 20, 1792, eleven p. m. Madame Tourzelle ("Recit de ce qui s'est passé à la journée du 20 juin") who was in the château says the time was two hours and a quarter.

[158] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 317; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 267, p. 274; *Moniteur,* XII, 718. The *Moniteur* says the assembly adjourned at four o'clock but the other two papers say half past three. Goupilleau, a deputy, also says half past three. "Lettre de Goupilleau," June 20, 1792, eleven p. m.

[159] "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers;" Paroy, *Mémoires.* The reports of officers on duty at the Tuileries show that some attempt was made by the commandant to guard the premises. See reports of Perre, Aclocq, Lagarde, Carle, Rulhière, Lassus, Leclerc, Mandat, Pinon and Mussery. Bourcet, an eye witness of this scene, states that there were also cannon and guards placed on the terrace, *Révolution française,* XVII, 73;

Digitized by Google

The procession on leaving the assembly hall by the door leading into the court of the *manège,* could have retired by either of two routes. It could have followed the long, narrow passageway leading out to the rue Saint-Honoré, or it could have broken through the gate which, at the end of the court, led to the garden of the Tuileries, passed along the façade of the château and out by the gate of the Pont Royal to the quays beyond. It chose the latter route.[160]

The crowd moving on to the end of the court of the *manège* forced the gate of the Dauphin leading to the terrace which extended along the façade of the château.[161] Mouchet was stationed at this gate, exhorting the national guards to remove their bayonets and directing the march. He was approached by Desmousseaux, substitute for the procureur of the commune, accompanied by Cousin, a municipal officer. Desmousseaux asked him to remove his scarf, because he thought he was compromising his official dignity by fraternizing too freely with the crowd. Mouchet did so.[162]

Battalions of national guards were ranged along the façade of the Tuileries, forming a military front, and the crowd passed before them. The march was peaceable and orderly and the people were joyous. There were some cries of "Long live the nation," "Down with the veto," some gross expressions and some menaces as they passed under the king's window. These menaces did not, however, represent the spirit of the crowd, but were uttered by

---

Goupilleau, a deputy, who crossed the Carrousel says there were guards and cannon there. "Lettre de Ph-Ch-Ai Goupilleau."

[160] See map, Brette, *Histoire des édifices où ont siégé les assemblés,* 159; also Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours,* 38–40.

[161] See map as above and Roederer, 40; "Rapport du chef de la deuxième legion" [Aclocq.]

[162] "Déclaration du sieur Desmousseaux;" "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Mouchet." Mouchet played a very active rôle on the 20th of June according to many witnesses. He was popular and could influence the crowd. He is described as "small, brown and bandy-legged," "Declaration de Turot," "Déclaration de Mussery." After the 10th of August, when he played a rôle at the Hôtel de Ville, he disappears from history. He was a contractor and captain of grenadiers. See *L'almanach royal de 1792.*

Digitized by Google

individuals who could be easily counted.[163] One little incident disturbed the march for a moment. A street vender selling tricolored bands with the word constitution upon them dropped them and for a minute it was thought they were thrown from the window of the château. Through the efforts of Patris, a municipal officer, the goods were restored to the owner and the agitation subsided.[164] As the procession passed before the battalions, ranged on the terrace, some persons requested the guard to remove their bayonets. Several did so and others refused, all probably acting according to their sympathies.[165]

Seeing the cortège passing out by the gate of the Pont Royal to the quay beyond, it was believed, both in the château and by the spectators outside, that the crowd would disperse and go to their homes. So apparent did this seem that some of the municipal officers left the scence. Desmousseaux went home and Cousin went to the Academy of Sciences to which he belonged. Champion took Borie and Leroux home with him to dinner.[166]

But the crowd instead of continuing its march along the quay of the Louvre stopped when it reached the gate of the Louvre, called also the gate of the Carrousel. On each side of this large gate there was a small gate. These were known as the new gates and the one on the side of the château was called the Porte

[163] "Déclaration du chef de la sixième legion" [De La Chesnaye;] "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Borie;" "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Hû;" "Procès-verbal dressé par M. Patris;" "Déclaration de J. J. Leroux." Leroux, upon whose account alone Ternaux bases his statement, says the cries were, "Long live the sans-culottes", "Down with the King", "Down with the Queen" and that there were heard the greatest insults, menacing talk and frightful threats but he is not supported in this statement by any other witness. Yet in addition to this he says that the great mass of the crowd was peaceable and had no bad intentions. Leroux was one of the municipal officers who were not summoned to the mayor's office early enough to vote on the municipal decree of the morning and was not one of the men that Pétion had officially sent to the Tuileries. His attitude is not sympathetic toward the crowd.

[164] "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû."

[165] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet."

[166] "Déclaration du sieur Desmousseaux;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Borie;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Leroux."

Digitized by Google

Marigny. All three faced the river and opened on the Place du Carrousel. These were guarded by detachments of the battalions Petits-Perès and Petit Saint-Antoine under command of Perrè and Mussery with orders to prevent armed citizens from entering.[167] The guard at first resisted the crowd which tried to enter the gates. But when two municipal officers— the one (Mouchet) "little, brown and bandy-legged"—presented themselves at the head of a group at the Porte Marigny,[168] the guard allowed the column to enter. Mouchet insisted that they meant only to cross the Carrousel.[169] When this group had passed, the guards again defended the entrance against the crowd. Soon Hû and Patris, two municipal officers who had been ordered to the gate of the Louvre by a superior officer, arrived. They had been told there was some trouble in the attempted execution of an order. When they asked him what the order was, he replied, "Allow all persons armed, in whatever manner, to enter, but do not admit any unarmed." This seemed an unreasonable order and directly opposed to that which the national guards had received, but the officers executed it and then all entered, armed and unarmed alike, rushing in like a torrent in spite of the national guards.[170]

At the beginning of the march through the assembly, Saint-Prix, commandant of the battalion Val-de-Grâce, who we saw was forced to march with the citizens when they set out from the

[167] Lagarde, "Rapport de l'événement" etc.; "Déclaration de Perrè."

[168] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet."

[169] "Déclarations reçus par le juge de la paix de la section du Roi de Sicile," signed by Turot, Mussery and five of Mussery's subordinates. These men all speak of the physical infirmity of Mouchet and of his being so small that his scarf dragged in the dust. Lagard, Adj. Gen. of the 4" legion says that he was small with a spiritless, thin face. "Rapport de l'événement."

[170] Same as above. Also "Déclaration de Perrè"; "Déclaration du sieur Desmousseaux"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris;" "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû;" "Rapport du chef de quatrième légion" [Mandat]; Roederer in a report to the department read in the assembly, July 6, 1792, says that the accusation that two municipal officers gave the order to admit all armed citizens is absurd and contradicted by the facts, *Histoire parlementaire,* XV, 424. But Hû and Patris themselves say they received such an order and executed it.

Digitized by Google

faubourg Saint-Marcel, gave the order to the captain of cannoneers to go with his two cannon and his artillerymen to the Place du Carrousel, which was no part of the royal courts, and from there join the procession upon the quay after it had passed out of the Tuileries garden. They had been admitted without resistance into the Carrousel.[171] Alexandre had sent his cannon to the same place also, to await in front of the Hôtel de Longueville the march of the crowd through the assembly.[172] Perhaps the absence of these cannon induced the officers to give the unusual order to allow all armed persons to enter the Carrousel, to which reference has been made.

The Carrousel was soon filled, it being a small place in 1792, and much encumbered with buildings. It bordered on the courts which extended the entire length of the rear of the château. There were three of these courts, separated by walls seven or eight feet high. The one in the middle was called the Cour Royale, that on the side of the river the Cour des Princes and that on the side of the rue Saint-Honoré the Cour des Suisses.[173] Sentinels were stationed in the watch towers of the Royal gate about noon, with orders to let no one enter except by card and to allow no crowd to gather before the gate. About an hour later the order was changed to allow no one to enter with or without cards. At once, three municipal officers presented themselves at the gate asking admission. The guards refused, but immediately some one from the château let them in.[174] The crowd seemed confused, but peaceable and showed no signs of entering the château. They had crossed the Carrousel to the rue Saint-Nicaise as if to go out by the rue Saint-Honoré. Colonel Rulhière who had been stationel with two squadrons of gendarmerie in front of the

[171] "Rapport de Saint-Prix"; "Déclaration de LaChesneye." Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXVII, 81.

[172] "Rapport d'Alexandre." The reports of Saint-Prix and Alexandre indicate that the Hôtel de Longueville was a general rendezvous for artillery. See also "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet."

[173] See map in Brette, 159; also, Berty, *Topographie historique du vieux Paris,* I, 280, and large map at end of volume.

[174] "Rapport de Pierre Moiteaux"; "Rapport de Jean Forêt"; "Déclaration de Bron," Swiss guard at the Royal gate.

Digitized by Google

Tuileries facing the Hôtel de Longueville, believing that the danger was passed, dismounted and entered the Cour Royale, where he remained a few minutes talking with another officer.[175] Suddenly the crowd stopped, uttered confused cries and began a movement toward the Cour Royale, at about one-thirty. A group of forty people presented itself at the gate of this court demanding entrance to the château. It was opposed by the guards. According to Marotte, a guard on horseback, they said, "We wish to enter and we will enter; we mean no harm to the king and no one shall prevent us from going to him."[176] The guards resisted and the group retired, some making menacing movements with guns or pikes. Soon another group presented itself, but the guards closed the gate.[177]

About three o'clock, the chief of the second legion, Aclocq, who was in the Cour Royale, asked the municipal officers, Mouchet, Boucher-Saint-Sauveur and Boucher-René, who had just returned from their audience with the king and were also in the Cour Royale, to request the citizens in the Carrousel to delegate twenty persons, unarmed, to present the petition to the king. He assured them that they would be well received and that he would lead them. The officers stepped to the grating and addressed the crowd. They urged them not to enter the king's palace armed and said that the court was a part of the king's dwelling. They said the king would receive their petition in the form prescribed by law. Let them send twenty unarmed petitioners to enter alone. The petitioners entered and the gate was closed.[178]

[175] Rulhière, "Evénéments de la journée du 20 juin, 1792."

[176] "Rapport de Louis Marotte."

[177] "Rapport de Pierre Moiteaux;" "Rapport de Jean Foret;" "Rapport de Louis Marotte."

[178] "Rapport du chef de la deuxième légion" [Aclocq]; Rulhière, "Evénéments de la journée du 20 juin, 1792"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Rapport de Pinon"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Boucher-René"; "Rapport de Lassus"; the evidence is not clear here. Lassus who was guarding the gate says about thirty people entered and his troops closed the gate. Boucher-René says Saint-Sauveur closed the gate but says nothing of the deputation entering. Aclocq says he led the petitioners to the king. Pinon says Aclocq and two municipal officers were at the door when it was opened and a group entered.

Digitized by Google

As the gate closed, Boucher-René says he was pushed inside and separated from his colleagues. Mouchet outside now mingled with the crowd. He heard cries and noticed a commotion at the side of the Hôtel d'Elbeuf. It was reported that cannon were pointed at the people. Mouchet tells us that he rushed to the place and assured the people that this was a false alarm. He said the cannoneers were incapable of such a hostile act and that he had heard them express very patriotic sentiments and that they were devoted to the cause of the people. He said he would guarantee upon his life that the report was false. Thus the people were reassured.[179] But there were cannon at the door of the château and also at the Hôtel de Longueville opposite and there were chests of ammunition on the Carrousel.[180]

Romainvilliers seems to have remained wholly inactive during all this movement. His inactivity is attested by all his subordinates. He was on the terrace, in the Carrousel, or wherever the crowd was. The chiefs of the legions, Aclocq, Mandat and Pinon and Vanot, commandant of the battalion Saint-Opportune, either could not find him or, if they found him, could get no orders from him. Nor could the commandant at the Tuileries get orders.[181] These men, however, showed great activity in preventing entrance to the château and so did some of their subordinates, who were also unable to get orders from the commandant. All were equally powerless to enforce their own orders. When Lassus, a captain of gendarmerie, asked his colonel, Rulhière, for orders, he replied, "I have no orders, but I believe that the troops are here to support the national guard." Carle, a lieutenant colonel, says he asked Romainvilliers what he should do with his two hundred men. The commandant replied, "It is necessary to take away their bayonets." Carle retorted, "Why do you not order me to give up my sword and my clothes?" and

[179] "Procès-verbal dressé par Boucher-René;" "Rapport de Lagarde"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet."

[180] "Rapport de M. Lassus"; Poullenot to Pétion, June 23, 1792; "Rapport de Lagarde"; "Déclaration de Mussery"; Oelsner in *Revue historique*, No. 87, p. 81.

[181] "Rapport de Aclocq"; "Rapport de Pinon"; "Rapport de Mandat"; "Procès-verbal de Wittinghof," Ternaux, I, 404.

Digitized by Google

the commandant said, "Take what I say only as an opinion."[182] Romainvilliers justified himself afterward by saying that the mayor having permitted, and the king not having refused a request for twenty unarmed petitioners to enter the château and he having received this assurance from six municipal officers in the garden, he did not think he ought to oppose their escorts.[183]

Besides national guards, there were also some regular troops on the Carrousel at this time. These had been ordered by the commandant of war to the Place Vendôme in the morning to be reviewed. About eleven o'clock two detachments were led by Wittinghof, commandant at the Tuileries, to the Carrousel.[184]

Within the court there was anxiety among some of the national guards and when the royal gate was menaced there was a cry, "To arms," and the troops formed in line.[185]

This sudden movement toward the château seems to have been caused by the actions of its leaders. Saint-Prix, on setting out from the assembly where the battalion Val-de-Grâce had taken him by force, attempted to rally his men and to take back from the Carrousel the cannon which were ranged along the Hôtel de Longueville. His cannoneers refused to obey his order. Leclerc, the second in command, repeated the order. Again they refused. The battalion dragged its chief before the Carrousel, and took a position near the cannon. Saint-Prix tried to calm them. He gave orders to the cannoneer to take the pieces in front of the column and march back to the Gobelins. He refused, crying, "We will not go away, we have not come here for nothing, the

[182] "Rapport de Lagarde"; "Rapport de Saint-Prix"; Carle, "Evénements de la 20 juin, 1792"; "Rapport de Lassus."

[183] "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers"; Montmorin writing to La Marck, June 21, (*Correspondance,* Mirabeau et La Marck) says Romainvilliers was sold to a faction. There was a good deal of sentiment against Romainvilliers for his inactivity on this occasion. On June 28 the section of the Tuileries passed a decree asking the national assembly to dismiss him from service because he had forfeited the public confidence. The decree is found in Archives nationales, F^{7}4590.

[184] "Rapport de Lassus"; Rulhière, "Evénements de la journée de 20 juin, 1792."

[185] "Déclaration de Guibout"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73.

Digitized by Google

Carrousel is forced, the château must be too . . . ," and, pointing to the château, he cried "Come with me, cannoneers, straight to the enemy," and they planted the cannon in front of the Royal gate.[186]

With this movement the crowd massed itself against the Royal gate. The agitation became extreme and there seemed nothing to do but to fire the cannon, when some one from within called, "Do not fire, we will open!" Immediately some one raised the iron bolt that fastened the two parts of the double gate together, the gate swung open and the crowd—citizens, national guards, and gendarmes—precipitated itself madly into the Cour Royale. It was a torrent impossible to check.[187] A spectator testified that having once mingled with the crowd he was carried on into the court in spite of himself.[188]

There remained still another means of checking the crowd, but again there was a refusal to obey orders. At the opposite end of the court, under the vault leading to the grand stairway, there was another gate. The chiefs of the legion, Aclocq, Mandat and Pinon and Vanot, commandant in chief of the first battalion of the fourth legion, requested the guards and the cannoneers to

---

[186] "Rapport de Saint-Prix"; "Rapport de Lassus."

[187] It is not clear, from the evidence, who opened the gate or who gave the order to open it. No one seems to be willing to accept the responsibility of the act. Many witnesses outside simply say the gate was opened. "Procès-verbal dressè par Mouchet"; Carle, "Evénéments du 20 juin, 1792"; Rulhière, "Evénéments de la journée du 20 juin"; "Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers." Lassus, "Rapport de Lassus," also outside, says it was opened by guards and Wittinghof, "Déclaration de Wittinghof," (Ternaux, I, 404), outside, says Hû and Patris ordered it opened. This Patris emphatically denies. See "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris." We have but two witnesses inside, Bron, a Swiss guard, and Boucher-René, municipal officer. Bron says two municipal officers opened it, Boucher-René says cannoneers raised the bolt, and Roederer in his report to the department in July says a grenadier raised it. It is thus seen that there is no agreement among the witnesses. According to Laporte, intendant of the civil list, who made inquiry of all the Swiss guards, the Royal gate was the only one forced, the gate of the Princes and of the Swiss not being entered. Laporte to Terrier, June 27, 1792.

[188] Oelsner, *Revue historique,* LXXXVII, 81.

Digitized by Google

close it. They were insulted and ill treated. Pinon cried, "Are you sure that there will not be some one in the crowd capable of attacking the king?" But the cannoneers answered, "It is better that one man should be killed than we."[189] The adjutant general of the fourth legion, Lagarde, called to his grenadiers at the windows of the hall of guards, and cried, "To arms!" but they refused to obey and passed out of the building by another door.[190]

The crowd advanced with such violence that the cannon of Val-de-Grâce was carried on into the château and up the stairs as far as the hall of the Swiss, but here it was caught in the doorway and obstructed the passage. The crowd became impatient and furious when municipal officers (Boucher-René and Mouchet) reproaching the cannoneers for their zeal, ordered that the frame be cut away and the cannon was carried back to the foot of the stairs, where it remained till the château was evacuated. Boucher-René says he told the people that their violence would undo all the effect of their petition to the king.[191] There was no resistance now against the crowd, not a man for defense, not a national guard at his post, not a door barricaded or locked. The gendarmes in the court remained quiet spectators of the invasion and after the crowd had entered the château, the gendarmes in the Carrousel raised their hats on their swords crying, "*Vive la nation!*"[192]

The crowd pushed through two apartments and to the door of the third called the *œil-de-bœuf*. Aclocq, chief of the second legion of national guards, says that on seeing the situation he rushed to the king's chamber by the stairway of the Cour des Princes, at the same time asking Boivins, adjutant general of the fourth

[189] "Rapport de Pinon."

[190] Lagarde, "Rapport de l'événement."

[191] Saint-Prix, "Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Boucher-René"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; Procès-verbal dressé par Borie."

[192] Roederer, 45; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; Bourcet in *Révolution française* XVII, 73; "Déposition de Rougeville"; Montmorin to La Marck June 21, 1792. Rougeville relates that at this moment he met Romainvilliers, pale and distracted, crying, "All is lost! we are betrayed!"

Digitized by Google

legion, to send help to the apartments. He knocked and, giving his name, declared he wished to stay by the side of the king and save him. He was admitted.[193] At the same time Bourcet who, by way of another stairway, had rushed to the king, reached his chamber with a few national guards. They found the king, the queen, and the prince royal, Madame Royale and Madame Elizabeth.[194] Aclocq says he hastened to the king, seized him by the waist and insisted that it was necessary for him to present himself to the crowd. Then, grasping his majesty's hand, he swore to perish rather than see him insulted. The king at once consented.[195] With Aclocq and Bourcet, he passed to his cabinet, on through his bed chamber and thence into the *œil-de-bœuf*. He was accompanied by Madame Elizabeth, who heroically refused to leave her brother, and by his three ministers, Beaulieu, Lajard, and Terrier.[196] In the *œil-de-bœuf* the king was joined by Marshal Mouchy, the gendarmes D'Hervilly and Canolle, Guinguerlot and Vinfrais, officers of gendarmerie, LaChesnaye, the chief of the sixth legion, and some volunteers of the national guard, Fontaine, Gossé, Bidaut, Lecrosnier and Guibout.[197] The guards all testify to the little protection that the king had. Aclocq took the king's

[193] "Rapport d'Aclocq." Aclocq is much praised by other witnesses for his devotion this day. *Cf.* Paroy, *Mémoires*, 298.

[194] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73.

[195] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; "Déclaration de Fontaine"; Paroy, *Memoires*, 300. The statement that Aclocq told the king that it was necessary to present himself to the people is supported by Fontaine. The other evidence of demonstrative affection is Aclocq's, supported by Paroy, a friend of the king and queen. In the Archives nationales (C 222, 160[152]) is a letter from Bourcet to the king, dated July 9, 1792, recallng his devotion.

[196] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73; "Declaration de Fontaine." Madame Elizabeth's presence by the side of the king is not mentioned by Bourcet, but it is by Aclocq and Fontaine. She is likewise mentioned in the "Déclaration de Lecrosnier," in the "Déclaration de Guingerlot," and in the "Déposition de Rougeville."

[197] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73; "Déclaration de Guingerlot"; "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; "Déclaration de Fontaine;" "Déclaration de Lecrosnier"; "Déclaration de Bidaut;" "Déclaration de Gossé;" "Déclaration de Guibout;" Report of Niquille and Gautier to the police in the Archives nationales, F[7]4387.

Digitized by Google

right arm and Bourcet his left, and remained with him throughout his ordeal.[198] Meanwhile heavy blows fell upon the door from without and a panel was forced in. The king cried, "To me, four grenadiers of the national guard!"[199] and they rushed to his side. A grenadier said, "Sire, have no fear," and the king, heroic for the first time in his life, replied, "I have no fear; put your hand upon my heart; it is pure and quiet," and taking the hand of the grenadier, he put it upon his breast.[200] Gossé testifies that Madame Elizabeth, with tears in her eyes, begged the grenadiers to save the king.[201] As the tumult outside the door increased, the guards and officers surrounding the king drew their swords for his defense, but Aclocq ordered them to sheath their weapons,

[198] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73. In the year 1816, two pamphlets appeared written by Joly and Drouet respectively, in which both say they were guards with the king on this occasion. Joly, *Note historique sur la journée du 20 juin, 1792*, says he was on the king's right. Drouet, *Note sur les événements de la journée du 20 juin, 1792*, says he held the king's right arm and that Joly was on the left. No other accounts mention these men and their claims contradict the contemporary evidence.

[199] "Déclaration de Gossé"; "Déclaration de Guingerlot." The exact words are from Gossé. The same wording is found in a letter written June 21, by a former member of the estates general who was present in the king's apartments. The letter is unsigned, quoted in Weber, *Mémoires*, II, 179–95. The incident is mentioned by Guingerlot. The four grenadiers, Lecrosnier, Gossé, Bidaut and Guibout, have left their declarations. Another grenadier who was with the king on this day was Tupin, as is seen by certificates of fidelity given him in July by Aclocq, Mandat and D'Hervilly stating that he did not leave the king's side on this occasion. Tupin used these certificates in asking the king for a position. See the certificates in Archives nationales, F⁷4390.

[200] "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73; "Déposition de Rougeville"; "Bulletin avec détails sur ce qui s'est passé aux Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792," Klinckowström, II, 303. A pamphlet of the time, *Récit exact et circonstancié de ce qui s'est passé au château des Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792*, says this grenadier was Gossé, but Gossé does not mention the incident in his declaration. The pamphlet is anonymous, but is an extract from the *Gazette de Paris* by Durosoy. It states that it follows the notes of an eye-witness.

[201] "Déclaration de Gossé."

Digitized by Google

assuring them that their zeal would only endanger the life of the king. They obeyed promptly.[202]

The door was ordered opened, the bolts being drawn by a Swiss guard, and twenty or thirty people rushed in.[203] It is reported that one of the first who entered was armed with a sword blade fastened to a pole and that he tried to attack the king. Another carried a saber and a pistol.[204] Aclocq states that he cried out, "Citizens, recognize your king, respect him; the law commands you to do it. I will perish, we will all perish rather than allow the least harm to be done to him." Then he says, "At these words, uttered in a firm voice, the crowd stopped."[205] One of the grenadiers, M. Cannolle, cried out, "Long live the nation! Long live the king!" but no one answered.[206] During this pause of a few minutes some one proposed to the king that he retire to a window recess where he could avoid the crowd and where he could be better seen by them. This he did at once and mounted a seat which he kept until the crowd passed out.[207] Madame

[202] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; "Déclaration de Guingerlot"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73; others say that the king ordered the sheathing of the weapons. *Récit exact et circonstancié de ce qui s'est passé au château des Tuileries, 20 juin, 1792.* This pamphlet claims to be based on the notes of an eye-witness who was at the side of the king. It was written after the 23d of June.

[203] "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; "Rapport d'Aclocq." Paroy, who remained guard at the king's door all night after this invasion, states (*Mémoires,* 303) that at daybreak he made a drawing of the room as it appeared at the time the king gave the order to open the door. The drawing has not been found.

[204] "Déclaration de Lecrosnier."

[205] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; "Bulletin avec détails sur ce qui s'est passé aux Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792," Klinckowström, II, 303; Letter unsigned dated June 21, quoted in Weber, *Mémoires,* II, 190.

[206] "Rapport d'Aclocq." Canolle is referred to as protecting the king in *Le cri de la douleur,* 15.

[207] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73; "Déclaration de Gossé"; "Déclaration de Lecrosnier"; "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; LaChesnaye is the only one of these witnesses who says the king retired to the window recess *before* the doors were ordered opened. The others give the incident just *after* the doors were opened.

Digitized by Google

Elizabeth remained with the king. When she was asked to retire she said, "I will not leave the king." Aclocq tells us that since the window recess in which the king sat was not large enough for both, he placed Madame Elizabeth in a window adjoining, with M. de Marsilly, but she was not able to remain long and went to join the queen.[208] Six guards placed themselves in front of the king to protect him from the pressure of the crowd. Four were grenadiers, one a cannoneer and one an officer of *chasseurs*. The devoted Marshal Mouchy, in spite of his age, would not leave his lord for a moment.[209]

The crowd, armed with guns, pikes, clubs and sabers, advanced and soon filled the hall. Louis XVI, calm, tried to speak, saying, "What do you wish? I am your king. I have never turned aside from the constitution." One of the guards at his side testifies that the king waved his hat to the crowd crying, "*Vive la nation!*"[210] but his voice was drowned in cries of, "Down with the veto! Recall the patriotic ministers!"[211]

The hall was literally filled with a restless sea of heads, arms, guns, pikes and swords. One of the guards standing beside the king says that the heart of a calf marked, "Heart of an aristocrat," was carried aloft on the end of a fork and passed before

[208] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Aclocq is the only one of the guards who says that Madame Elizabeth was placed in a window recess, but Lecrosnier and Gossé speak of her accompanying the king to the *œil-de-bœuf*. Guingerlot also says she would not leave the king. See "Déclaration de Lecrosnier"; "Déclaration de Gossé"; "Déclaration de Guingerlot." Fontaine says she was led out of the hall before the doors were opened. Aclocq is the only guard who speaks of her after the doors were opened. His statement is borne out by "Bulletin avec détails sur de qui s'est passé aux Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792," Klinckowström, II, 303. Madame Tourzelle, who was with the queen, says Madame Elizabeth soon came back. See her *Récit* of June 22.

[209] "Rapport d'Aclocq"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73; "Déclaration de Guingerlot." Among these guards were Fontaine, Lecrosnier, Gossé, Bidaut and Guibout. See their declarations.

[210] "Declaration de Fontaine"; "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; Bourcet in *Révolution française*, XVII, 73. The exact wording is that of Fontaine.

[211] *Ibid.*, XVII, 73; "Déclaration de Guibout."

Digitized by Google

the eyes of the king.[212] As the crowd surged in, curious to see royalty at home, asking, "Where are they? Where is he? Where is she?" menaces and imprecations were heard.[213] It was noted by the guards that one man in the crowd, dressed in a green waistcoat, was one of the executioners of 1789.[214] Another guard recognized Soudin, one of the besiegers of the Bastille, armed with gun and bayonet, advancing toward the king with threatening words and manner.[215] Still another guard described an individual about thirty-six years old, poorly dressed, saber in hand, making great efforts to reach the king and using the most abusive language.[216] A handsome young national guard, whom the king recognized as having been a member of his body guard, addressed horrible insults to him.[217] All these were forced back by the volunteer grenadiers who formed a guard before the king.[218]

In the midst of this tumult the king remained remarkably tranquil, speaking calmly to each one who addressed him and protesting his loyalty to the constitution. It was believed by many of the witnesses that his *sang-froid* prevented greater violence.[219]

[212] "Déclaration de Guibout"; J. J. Leroux in his declaration says this emblem was carried along the terrace and was marked, "The heart of M. Veto." See also support for both of these statements in "Rapport fait au conseil du department par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort."

[213] "Déclaration de Guingerlot"; "Déposition de Rougeville."

[214] "Déclaration de Guibout"; "Déclaration de Guingerlot."

[215] "Déclaration de Guibout." Guibout states that Soudin had been driven from the battalion Saint-Opportune; that he had, at the beginning of the revolution, taken the heads of Berthier and Foulon at the morgue, washed them in a pail of water and given them to the people to carry on pikes.

[216] "Déclaration de Lecrosnier."

[217] Letter of Azéma, deputy of L'Aude to the legislative assembly written at eleven o'clock p. m. June 20, 1792. (*Révolution française,* XXVII, 172).

[218] This is stated by the guards around the king and is also repeated by the commissioners of the department in their report on the suspension of Pétion. "Rapport fait au conseil du département par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort."

[219] Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 76; "Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Paris en datte du 21 juin à Dupin et fils à Montpellier," in *Revue historique de la révolution française,* II., 597; Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXVII, 80; *Correspondance secrète inédite sur Louis XVI, Marie*

Digitized by Google

He also showed anxiety for his family, making inquiries now and then for the queen and his children.[220]

An incident is described here which has been often repeated by writers since that time, but for which our only evidence is the report of the commission appointed by the council of the department to investigate the events of the day. They do not state their authority. They say that after the tumult in the *œil-de-bœuf* had lasted an hour and none of the officers could make themselves heard, Legendre advanced toward the monarch and the noise ceased. "Monsieur," he began, pausing as the king showed surprise, "Yes, monsieur, hear us. You must hear us. You are a villain. You have always deceived us, you deceive us still. But take care! Your measure is full and people are weary of being your plaything." Then he read a petition full of menaces and reproaches, declaring that it expressed the wish of the sovereign people of whom he was the orator. The king remained calm, answering, "I will do what the constitution and the decrees have commanded me."[221] Again cries arose, more people constantly came in and the press became extreme.

Antoinette, la cour et la ville, 1777–1792, II, 604; *A Residence in France during the Years 1792, 1793, 1794, 1795,* 15; *Lettre de Goupilleau, député de la Vendée," June 20, 11 p. m.;* Azema in *Révolution française,* XXVII, 174; *Bulletin avec détails sur ce qui s'est passé aux Tuilleries le 20 juin, 1792,* Klinckowström, II, 303; *Ibid.,* 11, 307.

[220] Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 74; Letter of J. B. Mosneron to Louis XVIII, May 19, 1814, in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* XI, 115. Mosneron was a deputy and was with the king.

[221] "Rapport fait au conseil du département par MM. Garnier, Leveillard et Demantort, commissioners au sujet des événements du 20 juin, 1792." This report was made before July 6, 1792, and recommended the suspension of Pétion and Manuel and three municipal officers. Roederer gives the same incident, reproducing it from the report of the committee without citing his source. The incident is not found in any depositions, reports or *procès-verbaux.* Legendre is named by Lareynie in his declaration as encouraging Santerre and by the *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* June 22, XII, 3, as being near the king with his friends. The Abbé Lamar, "Les loisiers d'un curé déplacé," in *Pièces sur la révolution, journées fameuses,* III, 267, says he was present and calls him a Jacobin and a deputy. He was a member of the Jacobin club but was not a

Digitized by Google

The first municipal officer who came to the king's relief was Mouchet, wearing his scarf as a badge of office. Raised on the shoulders of two citizens, he approached the window in which the king sat. With voice and gesture he strove to gain silence, but his efforts were useless. He could make himself heard only by those near by. The king tried several times to speak, but his voice was lost in the tumult.[222] This situation lasted more than an hour, during which time the greatest confusion reigned. Shouts were sent up from the crowd and cries of "Down with the veto!" "Recall the ministers!" continued, while officers tried vainly to make themselves heard.[223] During this period of uproar a number of incidents can be clearly distinguished which show the temper of the crowd.

A man carrying a red cap on the end of a pole moved toward the king. Several people inclined the pole in his direction. Mouchet took the cap and passed it on to the king who reached out for it, took it and put it on his head. At this strange spectacle, the crowd burst into applause, stamping, clapping their hands and crying, "Bravo!" "Long live the nation!" "Long live liberty!"

---

deputy. An unsigned letter written June 21 and quoted in Weber, (*Mémoires,* II, 179) states that Legendre offered the king the red cap. The same statement is found in the *Correspondence politique* of June 23, LXIII, 2, which says Legendre was the national guard who put the red hat on the king. It is clear from all this evidence that Legendre was present, but it is not clear what he did. He evidently did not play a prominent part. It is stated ("Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Paris en datte du 21 juin à Dupin et fils à Montpellier") that the orator of the people said, "Sire, do you wish to be our king or not? If you do, enforce the constitution, the execution of which you alone have hindered. If you do not, you will be allowed to leave [France]. We will give you forty thousand men to accompany you to the frontiers. We will guarantee you your life until you leave the realm." This is not what Legendre is reported to have said. It may refer to the speech that the "blond young man" so often referred to, made to the king in Pétion's presence. The sentiment is similar. See below.

[222] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73; "Déclaration de Gossé"; "Déclaration de Fontaine."

[223] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73; "Declaration de Guibout."

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
Digitized by Google

and even, "Long live the king!"[224] A guard who stood beside Louis XVI says that threats were uttered against the king should he refuse to put the liberty cap on and threats of returning daily if he did not sign the decrees. But a municipal officer who was also present states that he did not think, judging from the disposition of the crowd, that if the king had not reached for the hat or been impressed with the idea of putting it on, that it would have been forced upon him.[225] Mouchet says that a few minutes after this incident the king pointed out to him a woman who held a sword encircled with flowers and surmounted with ribbons. Mouchet signaled to her and she passed it on. He handed it to the king, who took it and brandished it amid enthusiastic cries of "Long live the nation!" The king repeated this cry. Then followed more cries for the recall of the veto and of the three ministers.[226] The king made several attempts to speak, assuring the crowd that he had sworn to maintain the constitution and that he was sincerely attached to it.[227]

The crowd was still pressing in, cries succeeded cries, and the heat was extreme. Insulting language and abusive names were hurled at the king and threats were made to return daily, if he did not recall the veto.[228] The guards were continually forcing back individuals who were trying to reach the king. A pock-marked individual, wearing a brown frock coat, armed with pistol and saber, kept crying, "Down with the veto! To the devil with the veto!" Another man dressed as a national guard, wearing yellow epaulets, and armed with a gun, menaced all who

[224] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Déclaration de Guibout"; "Déclaration de Bidaut"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73. It is interesting to note in this connection that Joly and Drouet, guards with the king, but who wrote their accounts twenty-five years later, both claim the honor of having taken the red hat from the pole and handing it to the king. Drouet, *Note sur les événements de la journée du 20 juin, 1792;* Joly, *Note historique sur la journée du 20 juin, 1792.*

[225] "Déclaration de Bidaut"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris."

[226] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet."

[227] *Ibid.;* "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris."

[228] Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXVII, 80; "Déclaration de Bidaut."

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

opposed him and uttered insulting words.[229] A young man in a red waistcoat constantly shouted abusive words at the king, reproaching him bitterly for his conduct.[230] A market porter, armed with a saber, during an hour made desperate efforts to reach the side of the king, but was forced back by the grenadiers.[231] Mouchet, who saw that this situation was not leading to anything, says he proposed to the king that he appear upon the terrace of his apartment and speak to the people where he might be heard, but those around him opposed this. However, an order was given to open the gallery and so evacuate the apartment.[232]

In the halls and on the stairway the crowd became more and more congested. Municipal officers urged the people to go no farther, but to retire. Their efforts had no effect.[233]

Presently Santerre appeared in the crowd and cries of "Down with the veto! Recall the ministers! Sanction the decrees!" greeted him from every side. He tried to restore quiet.[234] A disinterested spectator, who stood near him, says Santerre cried out, "What the devil are you all talking at once for? That is not the way to be heard. We are not going to leave here. Don't you hear that the king wishes to speak?"[235] He then told the king to have no fear and said he would be responsible for the royal family.[236] Oelsner says that his *sans-culotte* eloquence made an impression and there was a moment's silence in which the king spoke in a firm voice. "I have sworn to maintain the constitution," he said, "I swear now faithfully to hold myself thereto." But the crowd

[229] *Ibid.*

[230] Oelsner, *loc. cit.*, LXXXVII, 80.

[231] "Déclaration de Bidaut"; "Déclaration de Lecrosnier."

[232] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet."

[233] "Procès-verbal dressé par Boucher-René"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Borie."

[234] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; Oelsner in *Revue historique*, LXXXVII, 80.

[235] *Ibid.*

[236] The statement that Santerre gave this assurance to the king is made by Paroy (*Mémoires*, 301) and by Madame Tourzelle ("Récit de ce qui s'est passé a la journée du 20 juin") in Archives nationales, C 222, 160[153]. These persons both lived at the Tuileries, so their information must have come from the royal family.

Digitized by Google

only mocked him with, "You have often made promises and failed us; we no longer believe you; we want no false oaths. Withdraw the veto! Give us back the patriotic ministers!"[237]

A national guard, to whom a bottle of wine and a glass had been passed, seeing the king's discomfort, offered him a drink. "Sire," he said, "you must be thirsty. . . . Permit me to offer you something. Fear nothing, I am an honest man and you may drink without fear—I will drink first, if you will allow me." The king offered to drink from the same glass. Amidst applause of the crowd, the king cried, "People of Paris, I drink to your health and to that of the French nation!"[238] But someone cried out, "It is not enough that he fills himself at the table, he must also fill himself here!" It was said that under other conditions, it would have been considered greatly to the king's credit to have drunk from the same glass that a man of the people drank from, but that now the *sans-culottes* considered such condescension as a hypocritical act and contemptible flattery.[239]

The temper of the crowd is plainly seen in an incident told by one of the municipal officers. On entering the château, he went to the apartment where the king was and saw a man held by the collar by five or six other persons who were going to put him out. On inquiring, he found that the man's offense was simply that he had cried, "Long live the king!"[240]

[237] Oelsner, *loc. cit.*, LXXXVII, 80.

[238] *Lettre de Blanc-Gilli au département des Bouches-du-Rhône;* Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 73; Oelsner, *loc. cit.*, LXXXVII, 80; Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* IV, 22, report made by an eye witness in the meeting of the Jacobin club on the evening of June 20. Oelsner says he did not see the king drink, but he saw the upturned bottle and heard the crowd say that he drank. The account given in the Jacobin Club was by the "blond young man", who addressed the king while Pétion was near. The incident is frequently mentioned by the newspapers and by later writers. *Récit général,* June 24; *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* June 22, XII, 3; *Journal du peuple,* June 25, No. 146, p. 581; *Journal royalist,* June 24, No. 5, p. 5; *Correspondance secrète inédite sur Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, la cour et la ville,* 1777–1792, Letter of June 23, II, 604. Madame Tourzelle also relates it in her "Récit" of June 22.

[239] This is the observation of Oelsner.

[240] "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû."

Digitized by Google

At the same time several members of the assembly, who had learned of the invasion of the Tuileries, appeared on the scene, though not in an official capacity. Since the assembly had not adopted Vergniaud's motion to send a permanent deputation of sixty members to protect the king, Vergniaud and Isnard, two of the most popular members of the Left, and Daverhoult and Blanc-Gilli, two members of the Right, upon their own responsibility entered the palace, forced their way through the crowd and came to the king's relief.[241] Daverhoult reported to the assembly that he pushed the crowd aside and as he reached the king, shouted, "You shall approach the king only by passing over my dead body."[242] Isnard, raised on the shoulders of two guards, spoke to the crowd after silence had been obtained by ringing a bell.[243] "Citizens," he cried, "I am Isnard the deputy. If what you ask is granted at once, it will be believed that it was gotten by force. In the name of the law, in the name of the national assembly, I ask you to respect the constituted authorities and retire. The national assembly will do justice. I will contribute to that end with all my might. You shall have satisfaction; I will answer for that with my head, but retire." This last phrase was repeated several times but no one retired. However, at Isnard's words there was a lull in the tumult. Vergniaud then spoke, voicing the same sentiments, but with as little success as his colleague, and the tumult recommenced. "Down with the veto! Recall the veto! Recall the ministers!" was heard again.[244]

[241] Reports of Dumas, Isnard, Lasource, Turgan, Arbogast and Daverhoult to the assembly, *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 331 ff.; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 278 ff.; *Moniteur,* XII, 718 ff.

[242] *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 269, p. 295; *Moniteur,* XII, 723, reports that Daverhoult said one of his colleagues said this.

[243] Nearly all sources speak of the use of the bell to obtain silence. Most say an usher rang it, but Bourcet (*Révolution française,* XVII, 77) says the king rang it and a report of the event given in the Jacobin Club on the evening of June 20 by the young man who addressed the king in Pétion's presence says the king made use of the bell several times. Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* IV, 22.

[244] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Déclaration de Gossé"; Oelsner, *loc. cit.,* LXXXVII, 80; *Lettre de Ph-Ch-Ai Goupilleau à la société popu-*

Digitized by Google

Goupilleau, a Jacobin member of the assembly, relates an altercation that he had at this point with several members of the Right. These gentlemen complained of the people for reducing the king to such a humiliating situation. Goupilleau answered that the fault lay with the evil councillors of the king, who had prevented him from hearing the truth and that they had been supported by the Right. Whereupon the members from the Right said, "Only Jacobins speak thus," and Goupilleau retorted that he was proud to be a Jacobin and placed his Jacobin card in his buttonhole.[245]

We have seen that the assembly adjourned immediately after the procession had left the hall at about half past three o'clock. The members, anxious about the situation, gradually returned to the hall and at about five o'clock a quorum had assembled and they were called to order.[246] It was reported by a member that the life of the king was in danger. "I ask," he cried, "that the assembly go in a body to save him."[247] Hébert requested that a deputation of twenty-four members be sent at once to the king, but this motion provoked murmurs from one side.[248] Then

laire de Saint-Vincent de Nantes; Isnard's exact words are taken from Fontaine, but in his report to the assembly the same evening, Isnard repeated the substance of Fontaine's words as the address he made to the crowd. *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 338; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 283; *Moniteur,* XII, 723. The cries of the crowd are reported in Gossé, Fontaine and Oelsner. Isnard says that after his speech the crowd became more calm.

[245] *Letter of Goupilleau* as above.

[246] *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 27, says the meeting was called to order by Guyton-Morveau and that Girardin took the chair a little later. *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée nationale* also states that M. Guyton, as ex-president, was in the chair. The *Journal de l'assemblée nationale* (XXI, 329), and the *Moniteur* (XII, 718), speak only of Girardin occupying the chair. *Chronique du mois,* June 20, 1792, also gives the hour as five o'clock.

[247] *Journal des débats et décrets* gives the name of this member as Regnault-Beaucaron, as does also *Annales patriotiques et littéraires de la France,* CLXXIV, 763. The *Moniteur* and the *Journal de l'assemblée nationale* give no name.

[248] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 329; *Annals patriotiques et littéraires de la France,* No. CLXXIV, 763.

Digitized by Google

Thuriot said, "I am far from believing that the king can be in danger in the midst of the people, but if the assembly desires a deputation to be sent to him, I willingly consent to its nomination." Whereupon Beugnot replied, "It is not, as M. Thuriot has said, the people who are with the king—these are brigands."[249] After another angry retort by Thuriot, the assembly closed the discussion.[250] It now became a question of the size of the deputation. Some one asked that it be composed of sixty members, but it was pointed out that if sixty members were sent away there would not be a quorum left and Cambon said he thought the assembly should remain in permanent session. Thuriot, still burning with anger, demanded that any member who calumniated the people should be called to order, and Brunck cried out that only a factionist could see the people in these brigands. The assembly voted a deputation of twenty-four members, the president, M. Girardin, named them and they at once set out.[251]

Scarcely had the deputation left the assembly hall when Dumas, who had been at the Tuileries, entered and reported what he had seen. He asked to be heard upon a question which concerned the public peace, the honor of the national assembly and the safety of the hereditary representative of the French people. He said he believed it necessary to give some executive power to the deputies by which they might secure the liberty and safety of the king, adding, "We have seen the king in imminent danger." This brought forth murmurs and protests, Charlier crying, "The king is in the midst of the French people; he cannot be in any danger," and some one retorted, "The people of Paris are not the French people." Dumas, still trying to speak above all this tumult, demanded to be heard in silence. He continued amidst

[249] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 329; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 277; *Annales patriotiques et littéraires de la France,* CLXXIV, 763.

[250] Reports do not agree on what Thuriot said.

[251] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 330; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 278; *Annales patriotiques et littéraires de la France,* CLXXIV, 763; *Moniteur,* XII, 718. The *Moniteur* is very brief here, stating only the fact that the deputation was sent when the king was reported in danger.

Digitized by Google

murmurs, "I have the floor; I will be heard in silence," but Chabot cried out, "M. Dumas has calumniated the people," and the noise continued. Dumas, however, persisted, saying, "These are not the people who surround the king; they are furious, misguided men," and called to witness Isnard and Vergniaud and others who had tried to speak to the crowd. He proposed that the assembly give orders to the commandant of the national guard to reëstablish order in the château and secure the safety of the king. [Murmurs.] He said it was manifest to him and to those with him that no orders were respected; that the king was not in a state of liberty where he could give orders; "He was surrounded, assailed, menaced, degraded by the emblem of a faction; he had the red cap on his head." Here tumult followed, murmurs in the assembly and applause in the galleries, and voices cried, "The liberty cap is not degrading," "Call him to order!" "Send him to the abbey!" But Dumas continued to insist that the assembly should take necessary precautions to insure the efficacy of the measures that the deputies would have to execute. He thought the fact that the constituent assembly had charged itself with answering to the nation for the safety of the royal family on the 21st of June, 1791, would excuse this assembly for showing itself similarly affected by their dangers in the month of June, 1792.

After several members had attempted to speak, Turgan[252] got the floor. He reported what he had seen at the Tuileries reciting, amidst applause of the galleries, the incidents of the king in the window recess, the red cap, the attempts of Mouchet, Isnard, and Vergniaud to speak, and the cries for the sanction of the decrees and the recall of the patriotic ministers. He said that the deputies were treated with the respect due them; that having gone into the apartments adjoining those of the king, he had persuaded thirty thousand people to turn back. [Great applause in the galleries.] He said he was not opposed to action on the part of

[252] This name is spelled Turgan in the *Journal des débats et décrets*, No. 268, p. 280, Turgand in the *Journal de l'assemblée nationale*, XXI, 332, and Targan in the *Moniteur*, XII, 719. Turgan is given by Kuscinski, *Les députés à l'assemblée législative de 1791*, Paris, 1900.

Digitized by Google

the assembly, but it should act wisely. He thought the assembly should remain sitting until the king was at liberty and that it should constantly keep in communication with him through deputations sent to the château. Charlier asked that twenty-four more members be added to the deputation and Lacroix asked that all deliberations be suspended until the deputation returned. Ducos thereupon announced the arrival of the deputation and asked that no action be taken until its report had been heard.

Immediately Granet de Toulon entered the hall and, as a member of the first deputation sent to the château, reported what he had seen and heard there. His deputation had arrived just after the appearance of the mayor and remained with the king until he withdrew to his apartments. At the close of his report, Lacroix proposed, as an amendment to Charlier's motion, that a new deputation be sent to the château every half hour so that the assembly might be constantly informed of the state of things at the Tuileries. This proposition was unanimously adopted and after some objections as to how the members should be named, the second deputation was sent to the king.[253]

Arbogast, one of the deputies who went to the château when the assembly adjourned at half past three o'clock, next reported what he had seen at the apartments of the king. He said that twenty-four deputies were not enough and proposed that another deputation of twelve members be sent to remain with the prince royal and the ladies of the court. This proposition was supported by members of the Right who said the assembly was responsible to the entire nation for the safety of the prince. This caused a tumult and on a vote the motion was rejected.[254]

---

[253] In this account of the assembly the *Journal des débats et décrets* and the *Journal de l'assemblée nationale* are full and agree on the facts I have given. The *Moniteur* is less full, giving only the speeches of Dumas and Turgan (XII, 718). The *Annales patriotiques et littéraires de la France* gives also a brief account of the session. It mentions more incidents than the *Moniteur* and gives short reports of the speeches of Thuriot, Beugnot and Granet de Toulon (CLXXIV, 763).

[254] Here the *Moniteur* and *Journal de l'assemblée nationale* agree. The *Journal des débats et décrets* does not mention the women of the court.

Digitized by Google

Lasource was angered at the suggestion that the king was in danger and stated that the fears for the king's personal safety were falsely founded; that the people had been in full possession of the persons of both the king and the prince and had done them no violence; and that the deputations were sent, not to show that the assembly feared for the king's safety, but to show its interest in him. He suggested that it was an insult to the French people to express fear for the personal safety of the royal family. His speech was often interrupted by applause and murmurs.

Isnard now entered and gave an account of all that had occurred in the palace up to the time of the entrance of the first deputation. It is clear from the way in which the reports were received that the Left was unwilling to admit that the king was in danger or that he was being insulted. Any suggestions of the kind were received by them with murmurs and other marks of impatience.[255]

Meanwhile the crowd in and around the Tuileries increased constantly. It had grown much larger since it left the assembly, being swollen by onlooking men, women and children, all anxious to see what passed in the interior of the château.[256] Among the throng in the garden of the Tuileries one observer noticed an individual attired in light blue with white embroidered waistcoat and curled and powdered hair. It was Manuel, the *procureur de*

[255] *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, 281 ff.; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 335 ff.; *Moniteur,* XII, 719.

[256] Isnard in his report to the assembly, *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 337; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 283; *Moniteur,* XII, 719. Turgan, in the same meeting, reported that he turned thirty thousand people back on the stairway. Four different accounts written by eye witnesses but unsigned estimate the crowd in and around the Tuileries at twenty, thirty, forty and fifty thousand. Klinckowström, II, 307; "Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Paris en datte du 21 juin à Dupin et fils à Montpellier," in *Revue historique de la révolution française,* II, 597; Letter unsigned quoted in Weber, *Mémoires,* II, 187; Klinckowström, II, 303. Inside the château the crowd is estimated by two witnesses at two thousand and seven or eight thousand. Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 75, and Wittinghof in his declaration before the justice of the peace quoted in Ternaux, I, 404.

Digitized by Google

la commune. He passed an hour in the garden, but not in an official capacity.[257]

At about half past five o'clock, or a little earlier, when the invasion of the château had lasted about two hours, and after municipal officers and deputies from the assembly had tried in vain to restore order, the mayor of Paris, Pétion, was announced.[258] He had not joined the procession and he had not

[257] "Déclaration de Maserey"; Letter of Roederer to the commissioners of the department, June 30, 1792. These men, Garnier, Leveillard and Demantort were appointed to make a report on the events of the day of June 20. They wrote Roederer June 30, their second request, to get from Manuel a report of his conduct on June 20. Roederer wrote Manuel on the same day making a second request for his report. He received answer from Manuel (according to Roederer's letter to the commissioners) saying that Manuel had spent one hour at the Tuileries June 20. Manuel's letter is not given by Roederer. See this correspondence in *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, I, 203–04. Manuel stated to Roederer that his place was at the city hall on that day. Desmouseaux, substitute for the *procureur de la commune,* states that Manuel was at his post at the Hôtel de Ville at nine a. m., June 20, "Déclaration de Desmouseaux." Manuel was suspended from his functions by a decree of the council of the department, July 6, 1792, at the same time Pétion was suspended. In Archives nationales, C 222, 160[152], there is found a handbill accusing Manuel of improper remarks concerning the national guard on this day.

[258] The statements about the time of Pétion's arrival do not perfectly agree. Fontaine, a guard beside the king, says ("Déclaration de Fontaine") it was fifteen minutes after five. Pétion himself ("Conduite tenue par M. le maire") says he reached the château a little before five o'clock. Allowing a little time for him to make his way through the crowd to the king, these statements agree. Another guard, Hémery, says it was between five and six o'clock; a deputy, Lesier, says it was about six o'clock; Becquey, another deputy, says it was two hours after the voluntary deputation from the assembly arrived. This deputation came to the château immediately after the assembly adjourned at three-thirty. This would put the arrival of the mayor at five-thirty. Another means of fixing the time is by the arrival of the first deputation sent by the assembly. The assembly met at five o'clock and after a ten or fifteen minute discussion sent a deputation of twenty-four members to the king. Allowing time for them to penetrate the crowd they would reach the king about five-thirty. Gossé, a guard at the king's side, says ("Déclaration de Gossé") Pétion arrived just after the deputation; Fontaine, a guard, says ("Déclaration de Fontaine") he arrived just before the deputation; Champion, a munici-

Digitized by Google

been seen in public since about eleven o'clock in the morning, when the decree legalizing the procession had been passed by the municipality. Pétion tells us that he remained at the city hall until half past two o'clock and then he went to the hall of the mayoralty. Here he received reports from the château through municipal officers.[259] He had given no orders looking toward the safety of either the assembly or the Tuileries. Two letters written during the day, one from the directory of the department and one from three members of the council of the commune, show that these constituted authorities were very uneasy. The letter from the directory was addressed to the municipality and asked for a municipal officer to give them information. The other letter was addressed to the mayor at half past four o'clock and signed by three members of the council of the commune, who had assembled at the city hall. They urged the mayor to send them instructions.[260] Pétion did not leave the city hall until half past

pal officer who helped clear the apartments, says ("Procès-verbal de Champion") Pétion arrived just before the deputation; and Blanc-Gilli, a deputy who had been in the room since the entrance of the crowd, says ("Lettre d'un député de l'assemblée nationale") that Pétion arrived at the same time as the deputation of twenty-four; Borie states ("Procès-verbal dressé par Borie") that he and his colleagues, Champion and Leroux arrived at the chateau at five-thirty. These met the mayor on the stairway. ("Procès-verbal dressé par Hû.") Still another way of fixing the time remains. The king said to Pétion on his arrival (see reference below) that the invasion had lasted two hours and Azéma, a deputy who was present, also says ("Lettre d'Azéma," in *Révolution française*, XXVII, 173) that the king endured this noise two hours. This again points to the time of Pétion's arrival as about five-thirty.

[259] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent." Sergent was at the mayoralty until three o'clock when he set out for the purpose of getting information. He returned at four o'clock with a report that he had heard it said that the people had entered the king's apartments.

[260] This letter states that the three men who signed it had gone to the city hall in response to a notice that each had received which read, "The peril is urgent; quick to the Hôtel de Ville." They ask Pétion if this is his order and whether or not the council will meet today. Both letters are printed in Ternaux, I, 208, note 1. Pétion did not answer these letters but at some time during the day he took time to write a letter to

Digitized by Google

four or a quarter before five o'clock, when he says he first learned through an adjutant that the Tuileries had been invaded.[261] He set out at once, without finishing his dinner, and drove in his carriage to the château.[262] He took with him his secretary Joseau and the administrator of police, Sergent. They descended at the Cour des Princes, the door of which they had reached with great difficulty, and putting on their scarfs, tried to open a passage through the crowd. They found everything much obstructed.[263] Here they were joined by Mouchet and Hû, municipal officers, who accompanied them to the apartments of the king.[264]

Mouchet had all the afternoon made the greatest efforts to keep the people quiet. He had been at every door that the crowd passed through, had stood beside the king for an hour, and finally, wearied by his fruitless efforts to clear the château, says he had gone out an hour before to get refreshments. Hû had also been out of the château for two hours, he tells us, to assist in rendering justice to several men who had been arrested at the château and carried to the police station near by.[265]

The progress of the municipal officers to the royal apartments was slow, the crowd being so dense that it was necessary to address them and urge them to make room. Pétion reminded

---

the president of the committee of surveillance of the national assembly calling attention to the fact that he had been informed of disturbances occurring in the south of France. Archives nationales, F^{7}, 4590.

[261] The note signed by three members of the council, Aug. de Bourge (notable), J. Hirmet, and Marie, asking for instructions because the danger was pressing, is dated at four-thirty p. m. (Ternaux, I, 208). If this was Pétion's first information of the invasion of the château then he acted on the information as soon as he could. But Sergent in his *procès-verbal* states that he returned to the mayoralty at four o'clock and had heard it said that the people filled the château from top to bottom. He must have told Pétion this because he left the mayoralty at three o'clock to get information. "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent."

[262] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[263] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[264] Mouchet refers to this court as the Cour Royale. The two courts were separated by a wall.

[265] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû."

Digitized by Google

them of the dignity that ought to be maintained by men who wished to remain free and who wished to preserve their constitution. This brought great applause. He urged them to guard against ill-intentioned persons who might slip into their midst and incite to disorder and so caluminate the people and their magistrates. Passing on up the stairway, several persons asked him if the king had withdrawn his vetoes and recalled the ministers. He stopped and vehemently said that the will of the king must be free and not forced and that the people could only prove its cause by moderation. He urged them to retire peaceably. All his words were greeted by applause.[266]

Reaching the *œil-de-bœuf,* Pétion and Sergent saw the king surrounded by several officers of the national guard, two chiefs of the legion, Aclocque and LaChesnaye, two deputies from the assembly, Isnard and Vergniaud, and some municipal officers in scarfs, Patris, Vigner, Champion and others.[267] Louis XVI still wore the red cap and Pétion later referred to him as "covered by the emblem of liberty."[268] Raised on the shoulders of several citizens, Pétion pushed his way to the king amidst great applause. "Long live Pétion!" shouted the crowd.[269] "Sire, I have just this instant learned the situation you are in," said the mayor. To this the king replied, "That is astonishing. This has lasted two

[266] "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû"; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[267] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Mouchet"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Leroux"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion." Champion, Borie and Leroux had been to dinner at the home of Champion and returned to the château just as Pétion arrived. They followed by the same way that the mayor took. Hû, who was with Pétion, speaks of seeing Borie and Leroux on the stairs. Champion soon reached the room where he found the mayor with the king. See the *procès-verbaux* of Champion, Borie, Leroux and Hû.

[268] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[269] Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXVII, 82; Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* IV, 22, report given in the Jacobin Club, June 20, 1792; "Déclaration de Lesieur," Ternaux, I, 406; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris."

Digitized by Google

hours."[270] The mayor then assured him that he had nothing to fear in the midst of the people.[271]

Pétion was raised on the shoulders of several citizens and tried to speak.[272] The noise was frightful and he had much difficulty in making himself heard. "Citizens!" he cried, and the crowd became more quiet. He told them that they had made their representations to the hereditary representative of the nation with a dignity becoming a free people and urged them to retire with the dignity with which they had entered. But the clamor and shouts continued and the people did not move on. They called for a definite answer from the king and cried, "Down with the veto! Sanction the decrees! Recall the ministers! Long live the nation!" Then Pétion, mounted on a chair, spoke firmly. He said that this was not a suitable time to demand of the king the recall of the veto, that he must have time in which to deliberate, else it would be said that the king was not free. He said he had no doubt that when the eighty-three departments of France expressed their wish the king would yield to the manifest desires of the people. He continued to urge them to retire. He said they had entered with the dignity worthy of a free people and had expressed their wishes and that they ought now to retire for if they remained longer they would give occasion to their enemies to calumniate their good intentions and those of their magistrates and again strongly insisted that they move on.[273] But while the people heard Pétion respectfully and applauded him, they replied to him with a demand for a definite response from the king and

[270] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Déclaration de Fontaine." The exact words are Fontaine's.

[271] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Déclaration de Lesieur."

[272] Sergent says he was one of those who helped lift him up.

[273] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion"; "Déclaration de Lecrosnier"; Déclarations made before the justice of the peace of the section of the Tuileries the 25th of June, 1792, by Montmorin, Hémery, Dorival and Dossonville, Lesieur and Becquey, in Ternaux, I, 404; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire"; Roederer, *Chronique de cinquante jours*, 61.

Digitized by Google

then there were heard again the cries, "Down with the veto! Recall the ministers! Sanction the decrees!"[274]

Champion, who was standing near the mayor while he spoke, was much offended and expressed his displeasure with the mayor's words. He was, however, reproached by his colleagues, according to the account of one of them, for showing too great excitement.[275]

During this scene of confusion a handsome, blond young man made his way through the crowd and approaching the king, spoke to him with vehemence. He addressed him as "Sire" and said that if he did not enforce the constitution and sanction the decrees of the assembly and recall the patriotic ministers the people would force him from the throne. The king calmly answered, "I have not turned aside from the path of the constitution." Pétion who stood near and heard these words addressed to the king said nothing.[276]

---

[274] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion"; report made in the Society of the Jacobins, June 20, Aulard, *Société des Jacobins*, IV, 22.

[275] "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris." Champion was one of the municipal officers who had not received a notice of the meeting of the municipal corps on the morning of the 20th. His *procès-verbal* shows great animus against Pétion and his statements that Pétion was indifferent in his efforts to clear the apartments are contradicted by every other account. His suppression of the things Pétion said in his address to the crowd amounts to misrepresentation.

[276] "Déclaration de Lecrosnier"; "Déclaration de M. Vinfray," both guards in the *œil-de-bœuf*. Aulard, *Société des Jacobins*, IV, 22, gives the young man's own version of this incident as he gave it to the Jacobin Club the same evening. The king's exact words are not established by the evidence. I have used the young man's own report of the king's words in the text. Lecrosnier says the king said: "You do not conform to the law. Address yourself to the magistrate of the people." Vinfray does not give the king's answer. The *Nouvelle correspondance politique* for June 24 (XIII, 2) says the young man's name was Clément and that he was twenty-two years old. The same statement is made in *Le cri de la douleur* of June 23. The paper is royalist and contrasts the young man's handsome exterior with his tiger's heart; Lecrosnier says he was twenty-five.

Digitized by Google

Pétion continued his efforts to start the crowd moving. Municipal officers succeeded in forming a double line of national guards between which the people could file and so could be directed away from the entrance to the apartments.[277] At the suggestion of Sergent and Hû the king ordered the apartments to be opened so that the people could pass out by the gallery. Pétion, still mounted on a chair, announced the orders given by the king to the effect that the procession should go out on the side of the corridor, repeated what he had said to the people before and continued to urge them to retire.[278] Sergent then spoke, but it was difficult to hear him because everybody spoke at once. He took off his scarf and displaying it in his hands, asked the people in the name of this emblem of the law to retire. In his efforts he was seconded by Patris and Champion, who threw themselves into the crowd and urged the people in the name of the law to retire.[279] Slowly the crowd began to move out between the lines of guards. As they moved along, there were cries of "Recall the ministers! Down with the veto! Sanction the decrees! Long live the nation!"[280] And as they passed Pétion, cries of "Long live Pétion!" were heard and the mayor saluted the crowd as it retired.[281]

The object of the mayor and municipal officers had been to relieve the pressure around the king so that he might pass into his apartments. Guards had already been placed at the lower door and in the halls with orders to let no more people enter.[282] But just at this time the first deputation that had been sent out by the

[277] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; "Déclaration de Fontaine."

[278] "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû."

[279] *Procès-verbaux* of Sergent, Champion, and Hû; "Conduite tenue par M. le maire."

[280] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû."

[281] "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Extrait d'une lettre écrité de Paris, 21 juin à Dupin et fils à Montpellier" in *Revue historique de la révolution française*, II, 597.

[282] "Déclaration de J. J. Leroux"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent."

Digitized by Google

national assembly arrived at the château and this opened the way for new crowds of people.[283]

The deputation was led by the deputy, Brunck, who addressed the king. He said that the national assembly had sent twenty-four of its members to assure itself of the state of his person, to protect his constitutional liberty and to share his dangers if there were any. The king answered that he was cognizant of and grateful for the solicitude of the assembly, but that he was in the midst of the people and had no fear, and that his conscience was clear.[284] Meantime the crowd moved slowly on, showing everywhere the greatest respect for the representatives of the people and for the municipal officers.[285] Pétion was now most energetic in his efforts, moving from apartment to apartment, urging the people to pass on. Municipal officers formed lines of national guards in the hall through which the people could pass out. With the help of some officers of the law who carried ivory batons, the municipal officers soon had the space around the king cleared once more.[286] Urged by the deputies to retire within his apartments the king accepted the suggestion which he seems to have refused twice before.[287] He was then surrounded by the deputies

[283] *Ibid.;* "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion."

[284] "Déclaration de Fontaine"; report made by Brunck and Lejosne to the assembly the same evening in *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 339; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 283; *Moniteur,* XII, 719.

[285] Reports made in the assembly by Lejosne, Dalloz and another member whose name is not given; *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 339 ff.; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 284 ff.; *Moniteur,* 719; "Déclaration de J. J. Leroux"; *procès-verbaux* of Champion, Hû, and Sergent.

[286] "Conduite tenue par M. le maire"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Patris"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent." Sergent says these men were Dorival and Dossonville. Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* IV, 23. The "blond young man" who reported this incident in the Jacobin Club said that these men with ivory batons said very politely to the people, "Respect the law!"

[287] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent"; report of Lejosne in the assembly referred to above. Fontaine in his "Déclaration" says that Aclocq proposed this to the king. It is probable that all urged the king to withdraw. According to their own declarations both Mouchet and Hû had

Digitized by Google

from the assembly and by national guards. They all passed into the state bedchamber and from there through a private door into his apartments.[288] It was now eight o'clock.

While the king underwent his ordeal for four hours or more in the *œil-de-bœuf,* the queen, in her apartments, also suffered great mental anguish. Late in the afternoon a detachment of guards was sent to her apartments and those of the prince royal with orders to let no one enter. They found the halls practically deserted, there being only three or four guards and only about thirty guns, abandoned in the rack. The crowd was already pounding upon the doors and trying to force entrance.[289] Meantime the queen was on the verge of distraction for the safety of the king and the prince royal. She had with her her two children, the prince royal and Madame Royale, the Princesse de Lamballe, Madame Tourzelle, Rougeville, Guingerlot, Paroy and several other members of the court.[290] When the crowd began to attack the door she insisted upon going to the king, saying she wished to share his danger, but was prevented from doing so by those present.[291] She had the prince sent to the apartments of Madame Royale, then brought back to her.[292]

---

proposed the king's retirement earlier, but he refused. He probably suspected the motives of these officers.

[288] "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; "Déclaration de Fontaine"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Champion"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVII, 77; *Lettre d'un député de l'assemblée nationale,* Blanc-Gilli; *Lettre de Ph-Ch-Ai Goupilleau; Extrait d'une lettre écrité de Paris en datte du 21 juin à Dupin et fils à Montpellier* in *Revue hist. de la rév. fran.,* II, 597.

[289] Declarations of Mussey, Turot, and Jaladon. The same statement is signed by four of Mussey's subordinates, Cuvillier, Chauvreau, Corps and Balin. These are found with those of Mussey and Turot in "Déclarations reçues par la juge de paix de la section du Roi de Sicile."

[290] "Déclaration de Guingerlot"; Paroy, *Mémoires;* Madame Tourzelle, "Récit," in Archives nationales, C 222, No. 160[152]; "Déposition de Rougeville."

[291] "Déposition de Rougeville"; Madame Tourzelle, "Recit," in Archives nationales, C 222, No. 160[152]; *Récit exact et circonstancié de ce qui s'est passé au château des Tuilleries, 20 juin, 1792.* This pamphlet gives details of how the queen insisted that she would go to the king and share his danger but was prevented by Rougeville and Aubier, who, authorized by Madame Elizabeth, forcibly detained her. This account is anonymous and

Digitized by Google

The guards outside made vigorous resistance for about an hour against the crowd that struck the doors and uttered menaces and insults against the queen. The people were determined to reach her apartments and in the struggle one of the captains of grenadiers, Lasue, was wounded. Seeing the uselessness of resistance, the commandant of the Tuileries, Lieutenant General Wittinghof ordered the doors opened and the crowd rushed in. Once in the apartments, the crowd showed great curiosity, overturning screens, forcing doors, rummaging beds, and at the same time uttering oaths and menaces against the queen.[293]

When it became evident that the people were determined to see the queen, she was taken into the council chamber of the king through which the procession must pass in descending to the court. Between the *œil-de-bœuf* and the council chamber was the state bedchamber through which the crowd passed.[294] With her were Madame Elizabeth who had come to join her, the prince, his sister and several ladies of the court, among them Madame Tourzelle and the Princesse de Lamballe. Lieutenant General Wittinghof, Lajard, minister of war, and Chambonas, minister of foreign affairs, were also beside her. The queen and her companions had been placed in a window recess behind the large council table in front of which there were two rows of grenadiers of the Filles-Saint-Thomas, commanded by Mandat.[295] As soon

was written later than June 23d and, being very similar to that of Rougeville, I assume it is drawn from him. See also "Bulletin avec détails sur ce qui s'est passé aux Tuilleries le 20 juin, 1792," in Klinckowström, II, 303; "Bulletin de ce qui s'est passé aux Tuilleries le 20 juin, 1792," dated June 21, Klinckowström, II, 307.

[293] "Déposition de Rougeville"; Madame Tourzelle, "Recit," in the Archives nationales, C 222, No. 160[152]. Paroy in his *Mémoires* says the queen first sent the little dauphin to the apartments of Madame Mackan, who lived just under the roof, by Hue, his *valet de chambre*, but in her excitement called him back before he got there and then she fainted.

[294] Déclarations of Mussey, Turot, and Jaladon.

[294] Guibout says in his "Déclaration" that the people cried, "Is this the bed of the great Veto? Monsieur Veto has a more beautiful bed than we have. Where is the great Veto?" etc.

[295] "Rapport de Mandat"; "Rapport de Lagard"; "Déposition de Rougeville"; "Déclaration de Leclerc"; "Déclaration de Guingerlot";

Digitized by Google

as the crowd began to cross the apartments, Santerre entered and took his place beside her, at her right. She seemed disturbed at first. Addressing her, he told her that she deceived herself; that the people wished her no harm; that if she desired it, there was not one of them who would not love her as much as her child did; he begged her to save France and assured her that she had nothing to fear. He then assumed the rôle of her protector while the crowd passed.[296] He ordered the guard to make room so that the people might enter and see the queen and as they passed he urged them on.

A woman in the procession offered Wittinghof a red cap, which he gave to the queen. She put it on her head and then on the head of the prince royal.[297] After a quarter of an hour Santerre, pitying the child's discomfort, said to his mother, "Take the cap off of the child, it is too warm." All this time, he kept urging the people to pass on, saying to them, "Look at the queen! Look at the prince royal!"[298] A woman in the procession stopped before the queen and, looking at her, began to weep. Santerre pushed her on, saying she was drunk.[299] The queen remained throughout this ordeal remarkably calm and courageous.[300]

Several municipal officers now entered the room where the

"Lettre de J. B. Mosneron" in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* XI, 115. Romainvilliers says ("Eclaircissement à demander à M. le commandant-general") that he sent a detachment of guards to the queen and himself watched her, but no one else mentions this. See also Report of Santerre to the mayor, Ternaux, I, 415.

[296] "Extrait du rapport fait par Santerre au maire," in Ternaux, I, 415; Oelsner in *Revue historique,* LXXXVII, 84; "Déclaration de Leclerc."

[297] "Rapport de Mandat"; "Rapport de Lagard"; "Récit de Madame Tourzelle"; "Déclaration de Leclerc"; "Déposition de Rougeville." The first three witnesses say that Santerre entered before the hat was presented; the other two say he entered afterward. The last two are the only ones who speak of Wittinghof giving the red hat to the queen. The others say some one gave it to her or a woman gave it to her.

[298] "Rapport de Mandat"; "Rapport de Lagard"; "Déposition de Rougeville."

[299] "Rapport de Mandat." In the declarations made before the justice of the peace of the section Roi de Sicile, two of Mussey's subordinates refer to a woman who was probably this one. Cuvillier says she was

Digitized by Google

queen was to aid in clearing the apartments; among them were Champion and Leroux.[301] Two rows of national guards had been drawn up by LaChesnaye, chief of the sixth legion, extending from the *œil-de-bœuf* through the state bed chamber, the council hall, and the corridors to an outside entrance and the crowd passed out between them.[302] Municipal officers continued to urge the people on, but many lingered, asking what answer the king had made to the demand for the recall of the vetoes and for the return of the patriotic ministry. Some complained that they had been brought there for nothing, but that they would return and would have what they wished. Two guards testified that they heard Santerre say on starting from the château, "The king has been hard to move to-day. We will return to-morrow; we will make him give in."[303] At about half past eight every one had retired and the queen and the royal family joined the king in his apartment. Weeping, they threw themselves into each other's arms and a touching scene followed.[304]

The deputies who entered the king's apartment with him remained for a time, when a second and then a third deputation from the assembly came in. These had all been required by municipal officers outside to show their cards before entering.[305] The last deputation arrived about nine o'clock and talked with the king and his family about an hour. The queen took them to

dumb and Guffroy says she wept. See their declarations in *Recueil de pièces,* XXXVII.

[300] Récit de Madame Tourzelle; Bulletin avec détails sur ce qui s'est passé aux Tuilleries le 20 juin, 1792. Letter of J. B. Mosneron in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* XI, 116.

[301] Declarations of Champion and J. J. Leroux.

[302] "Déclaration de LaChesnaye"; "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent."

[303] "Procès-verbal dressé par Hû"; Azéma, Letter of June 20, 1792, in *Révolution française,* XXVII, 172; "Déclaration du commandant du deuxième bataillon de la quatrième légion et plusieurs grenadiers et volontaires du même bataillon," signed Blouet and Pical.

[304] "Déclaration de Gossé"; Bourcet in *Révolution française,* XVI, 77; Letter of J. B. Mosneron to Louis XVIII, in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine, XI, 116; Note historique sur la journée du 20 juin, 1792, par le Sr. Joly.*

[305] "Procès-verbal dressé par Sergent."

Digitized by Google

see the little prince, who was playful and charming. Some of the aristocratic deputies flattered the king and queen, but the patriotic deputies made objection to this. The king spoke kindly of the people and made no complaint. At about ten o'clock, they all retired, leaving the family alone.[306]

Pétion, who had left the king when the deputation from the assembly arrived, continued to make the greatest efforts to clear the château. Carried on the shoulders of two grenadiers, he urged the crowd on the stairway, in the vestibule and in the courts, in the name of the law, to follow him, remaining at the principal door until all had passed out. He was ably seconded by the municipal officers, Sergent, Leroux, Hû, Patris, Mouchet and Champion. These formed lines of guards to prevent new crowds entering, urged the people in the name of the law to go out, and their efforts added to the zeal and energy of the mayor were effective. The people everywhere passed on without resistance.[307]

It was still a question of clearing the courts and the garden and closing the gate. Sergent and Hû with some national guards succeeded in this with little effort and closed and guarded the gates. Pétion with Sergent, Hû and Leroux, returned to the apartments to see that no stragglers remained. Finding all was well, Pétion went to the national assembly to give an account of

[306] *Lettre de Ph-Ch-Ai Goupilleau;* Letter of Azéma in *Révolution française,* XXVII, 172; *Lettre d'un député,* etc., Blanc-Gilli. Azéma says that in the conversation the king showed a remarkable memory for incidents and persons and details of the afternoon's events. He says he spoke of Santerre and of Theroinge. Theroinge is mentioned as being in the crowd by the *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* XII, 2; Varenne, *Histoire particulière,* also says she was in the crowd this day but neither of these state that she was in the château. Theroinge was a well known revolutionary character, a very beautiful woman of the *demi-monde.* One authority, a police report found in Archives nationales, F⁷4387, states that she was in the crowd on the 20th and that she did not cease to provoke the people to support the project of the faubourgs. The report is signed, Minot.

[307] "Conduit tenue par M. le maire"; Déclarations of J. J. Leroux and Legrand, made to the justice of the peace of the section Roi de Sicile; *Procès-verbaux* of Sergent, Patris, Hû, Mouchet, and Champion.

Digitized by Google

his conduct during the day. It was now ten o'clock and the courts and gardens of the château were silent.[308]

The constituted authorities plainly feared a repetition of the day's events on the morrow and so took precautions to prevent it before they retired that night. Pétion wrote to the commandant at ten o'clock: "It is reported, M. le commandant, that the citizens are going to the Tuileries tomorrow. I avow that I do not believe it, but as it is not permissible to neglect a matter of this importance, I ask you to bring an imposing force, to establish patrols, in a word to take every precaution for safety."[309] At half past ten the directory of the department met and passed the following decree: "Ordered that the mayor and municipality of Paris do insure, by all the means the law has put into their power, security and public peace, especially the safety of the king, the royal family and the château of the Tuileries."[310] They then wrote to Pétion asking him to come to the directory at nine o'clock in the morning with some municipal officers to arrange with them measures to be taken to insure public order for the day.[311] At eleven o'clock, Terrier, the minister of the interior, wrote to the directory: "I ask you, gentlemen, in the name of the king, to come to the Tuileries to arrange with us some means of insuring order this night."[312] He wrote another letter showing his fears for the morrow and said, "I learn, gentlemen, that the same gathering which occurred today is going to form tomorrow. I ask you in the name of the country to use all means which the law has entrusted to you to maintain order and prevent the deadly occurrence with which we have been threatened today."[313] It appears

[308] "Conduit tenue par M. le maire"; *Procès-verbaux* of Hû, Sergent, Leroux, and Champion; report of Montjourdan at eleven-thirty p. m., June 20, in Archives nationales, C 222, 160[152].

[309] Pétion to the commandant, June 20, 1792, ten p. m., in Archives nationales, F[7]4774[70].

[310] Deliberations of the directory, ten-thirty p. m.; in *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 177.

[311] Directory to Pétion in Archives nationales, F[7]4774[70].

[312] Terrier to the directory, June 20, eleven p. m., in *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 190.

[313] Terrier to the directory, June 20, 1792, in Archives nationales, F[7]4774[70].

Digitized by Google

from this that the threats of the crowd on going out of the château and their disappointment in not receiving a promise from the king were taken seriously. Especially at the Tuileries was the recurrence of the movement feared.[314]

During all the confusion and uproar at the château the assembly, which we saw resume its session at five o'clock, continued its deliberations. It listened to reports of the invasion of the Tuileries and continued to express its disapproval of any statement which intimated that there was danger to the king's person. The temper of the assembly and its extreme sensitiveness are seen in its behavior toward the next two speakers. Brunck, who was spokesman for the first deputation sent to the Tuileries, reported the king's remark that he had no fear because he was in the midst of "his people." This statement caused much disapproval and murmurs were heard. The assembly was calmed only by the remark of another deputy, Lejosne, who said that he had heard the king say that he was in the midst of the "French people," not "his people."[315] Dalloz[316] followed with the report that the representative of the people had everywhere received marks of respect. He added that the king, on being reassured by some deputies, answered that a good man who had a clear conscience is not afraid and that he took the hand of a national guard and carried it to his heart saying, "See if it palpitates and if I am afraid." This brought great applause.[317] The second

[314] "Observations du 21 juin, 1792," Soltho Douglas in Archives nationales, W 1ᵇ251. Sergent-Marceau says ("Notice historique sur les événements du 10 août 1792 et 20 et 21 juin, précédents") that this man, "le petit abbé Soltho Douglas," was in the pay of the court to give information to the police.

[315] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 339; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 283; *Moniteur,* XII, 719.

[316] Spelled variously: Dalloz, Dallot, Alos. The correct spelling, according to Kucinsky, is Dalloz.

[317] This is the second time that this incident, concerning the king, is reported on this day. The statement that it occurred at this time is borne out by Oelsner (*Revue historique,* LXXXVIII, 83), who was in the *œil-de-bœuf.* He says the king took the hand of a deputy and held it to his heart. The incident is a third time reported by Azéma (*Révolution*

Digitized by Google

deputation that had been sent out by the assembly now returned and reported that all was quiet at the Tuileries and that the king had retired to his apartments and had there said that he felt no fear in the midst of "his people." At these words the tumult broke out afresh and Becquey shouted that this was no time to quarrel over words. When the tumult ceased a deputy reported that the only violence committed at the château was the breaking of some doors and locks.[318]

Presently Pétion and some municipal officers appeared at the bar of the assembly and the tumult recommenced. Pétion was greeted with applause and menaces. His report was an attempt to justify his conduct on this day. He spoke as follows: "Gentlemen, I ask your indulgence because I have not had time to put my ideas in order. There has been some anxiety because of the great number of citizens who have gone into the apartments of the king. The king, gentlemen, has had no anxiety, for he knows the French people better. He well knows how his person has been respected for the last three years. He knows that the magistrates have labored without ceasing to assure the king the respect due him under the constitution. The magistrates, gentlemen, have done their duty, I dare say, with great zeal and I have been much disturbed that some persons have seemed to doubt it for one instant." Here he was interrupted by cries of, "And who still doubt it!" There were murmurs and shouts of, "Call him to order! call him to order!"[319]

Then a member demanded that any one who was wanting in respect to a petitioner or to a magistrate of the people who came to give an account of his conduct, should be denounced. Boullenger cried, in answer to this, that no one had yet denounced those who were wanting in respect to the king and those who were the authors of a plot and Ducos retorted that if Boullenger

française, XXVII, 174) as having occurred in the apartments after the king had retired from the crowd.

[318] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 341; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 285.

[319] This speech of Pétion's is the same in the *Moniteur,* XII, 720, *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 341, and *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 285.

Digitized by Google

did not denounce the plot, he would brand upon his forehead the name of calumniator. This brought great applause from the galleries. But the assembly refused Boullenger the floor and Pétion continued.

"Some people do not know what the municipality has done. It is not for me to pronounce eulogies upon its conduct, but I can say that it has performed its duty in a way that merits approbation." He then reviewed the movement since his first information concerning it. He spoke of the municipality having learned on June 16 that a petition was to be presented to the assembly and to the king, and said that the municipal council had refused to authorize the movement because the citizens had asked to present themselves in arms without specifying that they belonged to the national guards or to a battalion, but that, when circumstances had changed, this same council gave the battalions permission to march. He said that the chiefs of the battalions had presented themselves at the mayoralty and had assured the mayor that the intentions of the citizens were good and that the constituted authorities had at other times permitted citizens to march armed and that they had been well received by the national assembly. Why discriminate against them? Then they [the officers] said that they would not be the ones to prevent the citizens from marching armed. In consequence of this a prudent measure was taken by the municipality. The battalions were authorized to march and the other citizens were allowed to place themselves under the national flag and under the chiefs recognized by law. Thus the citizens marched legally and being under recognized chiefs would do no wrong.

This measure was communicated to the department, which did not approve of it. Immediately the police and the mayor had taken every precaution and had conformed to the letter which the directory had written to them. But Pétion said there had been no need of referring to the directory of the department because the public force could not act without authority from the municipality. He said that municipal officers had been sent to the gathering places in the faubourgs on the morning of June 20 to speak to the citizens and that the citizens insisted that they

Digitized by Google

would not form a mob nor cause a riot. In view of these circumstances, he called the municipality together and, believing that it would be very imprudent and very dangerous to allow forty thousand men to move without leaders, the municipality decided to legalize the movement by requiring the battalions to march under their commandants, allowing the citizens to range themselves under the flag of the national guard. It was under these circumstances that the citizens had presented their petition to the assembly and to the king.

He said that the citizens, having marched through the assembly and the Tuileries, respecting property and insulting no one, had proved that they had no intention of committing excesses. Any intentions of that kind could easily have been carried out for there was not sufficient police force to have prevented anything the crowd might have attempted. He declared he had gone to the Tuileries and had done all he could to restore quiet and have the apartments cleared as promptly as possible and that the king had nothing to complain of and had expressed himself so to the various deputations that the assembly had sent to him. He said all was now quiet at the Tuileries and that he hoped it would remain so. He assured them that the magistrates would neglect no measures for maintaining the peace. This was followed by reiterated applause.

In conclusion Pétion added, "I have heard it said that there are plots. It will be necessary for the public safety that these should be made known. I do not believe that any good citizen will refuse to give such proofs as he has, to enable the magistrates to baffle the conspirators. I ask all the members of the assembly who have proofs, to present them and the magistrates will at once perform their duty." This was followed by much applause.[320]

Charlier suggested that honorable mention should be made of the conduct of the municipality. Becquey opposed this proposition which was received with murmurs and cries of, "No! No!"[321]

[320] *Journal de l'assemblée nationale,* XXI, 341 ff.; *Journal des débats et décrets,* No. 268, p. 288 ff.; *Moniteur,* XII, 720.

[321] *Ibid.* The *Journal des débats et décrets* does not give the name of Charlier and the *Moniteur* does not mention Becquey. Otherwise the accounts agree.

Digitized by Google

After some other business had been presented to the assembly, Guyton-Morveaux, spokesman of the last deputation sent to the king, reported that all was quiet at the Tuileries, that the deputies had remained some time with the king and that they had seen nothing to cause alarm. He said an officer of the guard had reported that the château was clear and that the king had retired to rest. The assembly adjourned at half past ten o'clock.[322]

So ended the famous demonstration of June 20, 1792. That it was a popular uprising, a spontaneous outburst of feeling against the king because of his duplicity and his collusion with the foreign enemy, a feeling intensified by his dismissal of the ministry and his refusal to sanction the decrees of the assembly, is clearly seen. The war which had been forced on the court by the assembly and carried on in a half-hearted way had failed. Austria was presumptuously interfering in the internal affairs of France and the constitution which the revolution had made possible was not being enforced and was now threatened with overthrow. The king, in order to carry out his anti-revolutionary policy, dismissed the Girondist ministry and vetoed the decrees for the establishment of a camp of 20,000 *fédérés* to protect Paris and the assembly. In doing this, the king acted within his constitutional rights.

The assembly, although it believed that the king was using this technical right to aid the invaders and to defeat the revolution, was itself unwilling to save the country by violating the constitution.

In the faubourgs, where the people felt less respect for constitutional restrictions, there was deep seated distrust of the king, a strong belief in his treachery and fear of the foreign enemy. Ever since the outbreak of the war in April, the sections in the faubourgs had considered organized resistance to the menaces from the court within and from the enemy without France and this feeling had been intensified by the dismissal of the Girondist ministry and the veto of the decrees. The men of the faubourgs determined to save France by bringing pressure to bear on the assembly and by forcing the king to act in accordance with the

[322] *Ibid.*

Digitized by Google

spirit of the constitution.[323] Thus an early plan to celebrate on June 20 the oath of the tennis court by presenting petitions to the king and to the assembly and by planting a liberty tree took on, from these circumstances, a revolutionary character.

The movement had no definite prominent leaders. If Girondins or Jacobins were the real leaders, their acts have been well concealed, for there is no evidence by which to fix responsibility upon them. The Girondins wished the recall of their ministers and trusted that the uprising would contribute to this end. The Jacobins did not wish the return of this ministry, as that would continue a constitutional monarchy. They hoped for a new revolution which would overthrow the monarchy. The ostensible leadership of the day was in the hands of the popular idols of the faubourgs.

The failure to prevent the movement was due both to sympathy on the part of some of the constituted authorities and to their conviction that any attempt at repression would result in bloodshed. This led to a plan to permit and control the movement. The mayor, at first inactive, was forced to act by the decrees of the directory which was determined to check the uprising even though it resulted in bloodshed. The mayor, still cautious, on learning from the commandants of the faubourgs that it would be impossible to prevent the march without bloodshed, proposed to the directory to legalize and control it. The directory, however, stood firmly for repression, forced the mayor to instruct the commandants to this effect, and to send police to the gathering places. These officers made every peaceful effort to prevent the procession and when their efforts proved fruitless, the mayor and the municipal council, on the advice of the commandants, voted to legalize the march and give it leadership, hoping thus to render it harmless. The government, acting through the minister of the interior, stood with the directory in its effort to prevent the movement at any cost. The majority of the members of the legislative assembly were in sympathy with

[323] The feeling in the faubourgs is expressed in such pamphlets as *Grande discourse prononcée par le patriote Gouchon* and *Preuves évidentes des trahisons de l'état-major.*

Digitized by Google

the demonstration. The silence of that body that followed the reading of the directory's decree on June 19 indicated this. The debates show an unwillingness to condemn the citizens, a sympathy with the movement and resentment when the people's motives were questioned or when the king was said to be in danger. The national guard was divided in its sympathy. Several of its commandants were leaders of the movement and the general commandant was wholly inactive. Some of the guards expressed themselves as unwilling to fire on the people. Under these circumstances, it seemed impossible to prevent the demonstration.

The plan of the faubourgs was to present petitions to the assembly and to the king and to combine this act with the celebration of the oath of the tennis court by planting a liberty tree. The plan was not well formed and its execution was a good deal of an accident. The tree was planted, but not where it was intended. The petition to the assembly had been drawn up in the faubourgs. It voiced the fears of the people, charging plots and conspiracies, appealed to the assembly for protection of their liberties, advocated resistance to oppression as expressed in article two of the declaration of rights and threatened tyrants with the vengeance of the men of the 14th of July. It complained of the dismissal of the patriotic ministers, the inaction of the armies and the delays of the high national courts, but made no mention of the king's vetoes. Whether this omission was due to the fact that the petition was drawn up before the vetoes were officially announced or whether the framers of the petition were less concerned with the vetoes than they were with the recall of the ministers, is not clear. Possibly the demand for the withdrawal of the vetoes was reserved for the petition to the king, but of this petition we have no record. However that may be, the determination that the king should hear the wishes of the people on both of these questions was evident and was successfully carried out when the crowd entered the château.

Here the demand for the recall of the ministers and for the withdrawal of the vetoes was insistent. The distrust of the king was pronounced and the warning that something would be done, that

Digitized by Google

he would even be dethroned, if he did not change his attitude toward the revolution, was clearly voiced. The crowd withdrew from the Tuileries only when urged by Pétion to allow the king to decide freely concerning the demands made upon him and when assured that he would "acquiesce in the manifest desire of the people." The demands were not withdrawn. The people even threatened to return, if the king did not yield to their wishes; he was simply given time in which to act. Should he persist in his duplicity, should he refuse to recall the ministers and withdraw his vetoes, a second and more serious uprising, an uprising that would cost him his throne, seemed inevitable. The affair of June 20 was not, then, a wild outbreak of unreasoning popular fury, but a demonstration of the political intelligence of the residents of the faubourgs of Paris, of their determination to put an end to a situation that had already lasted too long. On that day Louis XVI received his last opportunity to abandon his policy of duplicity and frankly accept the revolution. He failed to understand and on August 10 the men of the faubourgs kept their promise, returned to the Tuileries, forced the suspension of the king and saved France from the invading armies. The days of June 20 and August 10, 1792 are inseparable and are no less significant than that of July 14, 1789.[324]

[324] That the significance of this day was clearly understood by the Russian government is shown by the fact that diplomatic relations were broken off with France because of it. On July 19, Catharine II sent a note of dismissal to M. Genet, *chargé des affaires de France.* Relations were not to be renewed until the king of France should be reinstated in his rights and prerogatives. Catharine understood that the events of June 20 were a menace to all royalty. In a letter to Grimm, August 13, 1792, she said so and explained her reasons for dismissing Genet. *Recueil des instructions donnés aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France,* II, 530, 536. The royalists throughout France felt the significance of the day also and expressed their abhorrence in pamphlets and addresses to the king on the following days. See *Addresse au roi après la journée du 20 juin, 1792; Au roi; Aux citoyens amis de la constitution par les fédéres; De l'affreuse conspiration qui vient d'être découverte par des members de l'assemblée nationale; Description de la fête civique donnée au roi; Lettre au roi presenté par ses fidèles sujets,* signed P. M. D. V.; *Paroles d'un vrai Français.*

Digitized by Google

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

A. MANUSCRIPT. ARCHIVES NATIONALES

1. C 185, No. 526: Terrier, Letter to Louis XVI, eight o'clock, June 20, 1792.
2. C 222, No. 160[188]: (1) Bourcet, Letter to the king, July 9, 1792; (2) Montjourdain, commandant with the prince royal, report eleven-thirty p. m., June 20, 1792; (3) Tourzelle, Mme., *Récit de se qui s'est passé à la journée du 20 juin, 1792,* June 22, 1792.
3. F[7]3688: Correspondence of the minister of the interior. (1) The Directory to Terrier, June 20, 1792; (2) Terrier to the committee of twelve, June 22, 1792; (3) Roederer to Terrier, June 26, 1792.
4. F[7]4387: Police reports, (1) Minot, June 20, 1792; (2) Niquille and Gautier to the police, ten-thirty a. m., June 22, 1792; (3) Police report on the *Chevaliers du poignard,* June 20, 1792. (Unsigned.)
5. F[7]4390[A]: Certificates concerning events in the château, June 20, 1792, made by (1) Aclocq, July 15, 1792; (2) D'Hervilly, July 16, 1792; (3) Mandat, July 15, 1792.
6. F[7]4590: (1) Pétion's letter to the president of the committee of serveillance of the national assembly, June 20, 1792; (2) Decree of the section of the Tuileries, June 28, 1792.
7. F[7]4774[19]. A group of letters consisting chiefly of correspondence between the mayor of Paris and other officials: (1) Pétion to the commandant Romainvilliers, June 18, 1792; (2) Pétion to Dumont, commissioner of police of the section Montreuil, June 10, 1792; (3) Pétion to Sergent, five a. m., June 20, 1792; (4) Pétion to the commandant, ten p. m., June 20, 1792; (5) Alexander to Pétion, June 20, 1792; (6) Laffond to Pétion and municipal officers, one forty-five p. m., June 20, 1792; (7) Longchamp to Pétion, June 20, 1792; (8) Poullenot to Pétion, June 23, 1792; (9) Renaud, commandant of Saint-Marcel, to Pétion, June 20, 1792; (10) Roederer to Pétion, June 20, 1792; (11) Terrier to the Directory, June 20, 1792.
8. W 1[b]. 251 (Dossier Soltho Douglas). Police reports. (1) Observations du 19 juin, 1792; (2) Observations du 20 juin, 1792; (3) Observations du 21 juin, 1792. These are all signed Soltho Douglas.

Digitized by Google

B. Printed

1. *Collections. Documents and Correspondence*

a. Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces sur les événements du vingt juin, 1792. This volume was published by order of the directory of the department and consists of two parts.

(1) Part I, *Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces relatives à l'arrêté du conseil du département du 6 juillet, 1792, concernant le maire et le procureur de la commune de Paris, Paris, d'imprimérie royale, 1792.* It contains four documents which relate to the suspension of the mayor and the prosecuting attorney of the commune from their functions. They are: (a) Proclamation du roi concernant l'arrêté du conseil du département du 6 juillet, qui suspend provisoirement le maire et le procureur de la commune de Paris, du 11 juillet, 1792. (b) L'arrêté du conseil du département du 6 juillet, 1792. (c) Rapport et conclusion du procureur général-syndic du département de Paris, relativement aux événements du 20 juin; lu au conseil du département le 6 juillet, 1792. (d) Extrait des registers du conseil du département. Procès-verbal de la séance du conseil du vendredi 6 juillet, 1792.

(2) Part II is entitled *Pièces justificatives sur les événements du vingt juin, 1792.* This is paged separately and contains 94 pages. It consists of letters, declarations, reports and procès-verbaux of officers as follows: (a) Letters. 1′. Copie de la lettre écrite au procureur-général syndic du département, par le maire de Paris, 18 juin, 1792. No. I. Also reproduced in *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, I, 162. 2′. Copie du lettre addressé au directoire, le 20 juin à minuit, per MM. les maires et officiers municipaux au département de Paris. No. II. Printed in Ternaux, I, 145, and in *Arch. parl.,* XLV, 441. 3′. Copie de la lettre écrite par M. Pétion à M. Roederer, le 20 juin, 1792, 5 heures du matin. Original in *Arch nat.,* $F^{7}4774^{10}$. No. III. 4′. Copie de la lettre écrite aux maire et officiers municipaux, administrateurs de police, par le directoire du département, 20 juin, 1792, à cinq heures du matin. Also found in *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, 166, and *Arch. parl.,* XLV, 442. No. IV. 5′. Copie de la lettre écrite au commandant générale de la garde nationale, par le directoire du département de Paris, 20 juin, 1792, à cinq heures et demi du matin. Also in *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, I, 167. No. V. 6′. Copie de la lettre écrite au ministre de l'interieur, par le directoire du département de Paris, 20 juin, 1792, à six heures du matin. Also found in *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, I, 167, and *Arch. parl.,* XLV, 441. No. VI. 7′. Copie de la

Digitized by Google

lettre du ministre de l'intérieur au directoire du département du 20 juin, 1792. Found also in *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur,* where it is dated nine o'clock a. m. Also in *Arch. parl.,* XLV, 442. No. VIII. (b) Reports. 1′. Rapport que fait M. de Romainvilliers, commandant-général, des faits qui sont passés dans la malheureuse journée du 20 juin, 1792, et journées antécédentes. No. XV. Addition au rapport que le commandant-général a eu l'honneur de présenter au département. No. XXXI. Printed also in *Hist. parl.,* XV, 147, and in *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, I, 214. 2′. Rapport du chef de la deuxième légion, à MM. les administrateurs du département, sur l'ordre qu'il en a reçu concernant l'affaire arrivée au château le 20 juin, 1792 (Aclocq). No. XVI. 3′. Rapport de Terrier au directoire du département concernant l'ouverture de la porte de la cour royale, 26 juin, 1792. No. XVIII. Printed in *Revue rétrospective,* 2e série, I, 202. 4′. Rapport de l'événement arrivée au château des Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792. Signed by Lagarde, adjutant-général de la 4e légion. No. XIX. 5′. Événements du 20 juin, 1792, signed Carle, 1st lieutenant colonel, 30th division. No. XXI. 6′. Événements de la journée du mercredi 20 juin, 1792, signed Rulhière, Col. 29th division of Nat. guards. No. XXIV. 7′. Rapport de Pierre Moiteaux, gendarme of the 29th division of Nat. gendarmerie. No. XXV. 8′. Rapport de M. Lassus, Événements de la journée du 20 juin, 1792 (1st Captain of 29th division of Nat. gendarmerie). No. XXVI. 9′. Rapport de Louis Marotte, adjutant (of 29th division of Nat. gendarmerie). No. XXVII. 10′. Rapport de Jean Forêt (gendarme, 29th division of Nat. gendarmerie). No. XXVIII. 11′. Copie du rapport du chef de la quatrième légion, sur la journée du 20 juin, 1792, signed Mandat. No. XXXIV. 12′. Rapport de ce qui s'est passé dans le bataillon du Val-de-Grâce et conduit des deux commandants de ce bataillon, la journée du 20 juin, 1792, avec les pièces justificatives à l'appui, certificates véritables par M. Saint-Prix, commandant en chef. No. XXXV. 13′. Rapport de Pinon (chef du 5th légion). No. XXXVI. (c) Declarations. 1′. Déclaration de Leclerq (commandant en chef, 4th bataillon, 5th légion). No. VII. Also in *Revue rétrospective,* 2e série, I, 169. 2′. Déclaration du commandant du deuxième bataillon de la quatrième légion et plusieurs grenadiers et volontaires du même bataillon (signed Perré, Berger, Blouet, Sallier, Stadel, Lesecq, Duhaviel and Calame). No. X. 3′. Déclaration du Sieur Bidault le jeune. No. XI. Also in *Hist. parl.,* XV, 162, and *Revue rétrospective,* 2 série, I, 205. 4′. Déclaration du sieur Lecrosnier,

Digitized by Google

négociant grenadier du bataillon de Saint-Opportune. No. XII. Also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 163, and *Revue rétrospective*, 2e série, I, 205. 5′. Déclaration du sieur Gossé, grenadier voluntaire du bataillon de Saint-Opportune. No. XIII. Also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 163, and *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 210. 6′. Copie de la déclaration de M. Guibout, grenadier du bataillon de Saint-Opportune. No. XIV. Also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 164, and *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 211. 7′. A messieurs du directoire du département de Paris, signed Jaladon volunteer, 4″ bataillon, 1st légion. No. XVII. Also in archives of the ministry of justice. 8′. A messieurs composant le directoire du département de Paris, signed Maserey. No. XXIII. 9′. Déclaration du chef de la sixième légion de la garde nationale Parisienne, signed LaChesnaye. No. XXIX. 10′. Déclaration faite à MM. du directoire du département de Paris par Leclerc, adjutant général de la première légion de la garde nationale Parisienne sur le fait dont il a été temoin dans la journée du 20 juin, 1792. No. XXX. 11′. Déclaration de Pierre Joseph Bron, Suisse de la Porte Royale. No. XXXII. 12′. Déclaration du Sieur Desmousseaux (Substitute of the Procureur-syndic of the commune). No. XXXIII. 13′. Déclaration du Saint-Fontaine (volunteer of the 8th battalion of the 2d legion). No. XXXVII. 14′. Déclaration reçue par le juge de paix de la section du Roi de Sicile, signed separately by Lareynie, Turot, Mussey and one by Cuvillier, Chauvreau, Corps, Ballin and another by Legrand. No. XXXVII. Lareynie's declaration is found also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 116. (d) Procès-verbaux. 1′. Section de Montreuil, Procès-verbal de la protestation de MM. Bonneau et Savin, commandants du bataillon de Saint-Marguerite. No. IX. Also in *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 175. 2′. Extrait du registre des déliberations du corps municipal du 20 juin, 1792, neuf heures du matin. No. XX. Also found in *Compte rendu*, 7.

b. Compte rendu par M. le maire et procès-verbaux dressés par les officiers municipaux, sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792. Réimprimés par ordre du corps municipal, Paris, 1792. This collection contains the following documents: (1) Decrees. (a) Arrêté du corps municipal 8 juillet, 1792. (b) Arrêté du conseil général de la commune, 16 juin, 1792. Also in Ternaux, I, 137. (c) Arrêté du directoire du département, 19 juin, 1792. Also in *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur à l'assemblée nationale sur les precautions prises relativement aux événements du 20 juin, 1792.* (d) Arrêté du corps municipal, 20 juin, 1792. Also in *Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces.* (2) Reports of municipal officers. (a) Conduite tenue par

Digitized by Google

M. le maire de Paris à l'occasion des événements du 20 juin, 1792. Also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 170. (b) Procès-verbal dressé le 20 juin, 1792, par MM. Mouchet, Guiard et Thomas, officiers municipaux. Also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 124, and *Revue rétrospective*, 2e série, I, 172. (c) Procès-verbal dressé le 20 juin, 1792, par MM. Mouchet et Boucher-Saint-Sauveur, officiers municipaux. (d) Procès-verbal dressé le 20 juin, 1792, par M. Mouchet. (e) Procès-verbal dressé sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792, par M. Patris, officier muncipal. (f) Procès-verbal dressé par M. Perron, officier municipal sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792. Also in *Hist. parl.*, XV, 120, and in *Revue rétrospective*, 2 série, I, 170. (g) Procès-verbal dressé sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792, par M. Sergent, administrateur au département de la police. (h) Procès-verbal dressé le 20 juin, 1792, par M. Boucher-René, officier municipal. (i) Procès-verbal dressé par M. Borie, officier municipal, sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792. (j) Procès-verbal dressé par Hû, officier municipal, sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792. (k) Procès-verbal dressé par M. Champion, officier municipal, sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792. (l) Déclaration de M. J. J. Leroux, sur les événements du 20 juin, 1792. (m) Déclaration de M. Jallier, officier municipal sur la journée du 20 juin, 1792.

c. *Revue rétrospective*, 2e sèrie, I, 1835. (1) Letter from Pétion's office in his absence to Roederer, June 8, 1792; (2) Letter of Terrier to the directory, eleven a. m., June 20, 1792; (3) Deliberations of the directory, 11:30 p. m., June 20, 1792; (4) Letter of Terrier to the directory, 11 p. m., June 20, 1792; (5) Letter of the commissioners to Roederer, two o'clock, June 30, 1792; (6) Letter of Roederer to Manuel, two-thirty o'clock, June 30, 1792; (7) Letter of Roederer to the commissioners, nine o'clock, June 30, 1792; (8) Rapport fait au conseil du département par MM. Garnier, Levillard et Demantort, commissioners named by the council of the department to report on June 20, 1792.

d. Aulard, F. A. *La société des Jacobins, recueil de documents pour l'histoire du club des Jacobins de Paris.* 5 vols., Paris, 1892.

e. Brette, Armand. *Recueil de documents relatifs à la convocation des états généraux de 1789.* 3 vols., Paris, 1894.

f. Rambaud, A. *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministers de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la révolution française, 1749–1789.* Paris, 1890.

g. *Rapport du ministre de l'intérieur à l'assemblée nationale sur les precautions prises relativement aux événements du 20 juin.* This report was made June 21st and contains the following letters supporting it: (1) Letter of Terrier to the directory, 2:30 p. m., June 19, 1792. (2) Letter of the directory to Terrier, June 19, 1792. (3) Letter

Digitized by Google

of the directory to Terrier, 7 a. m., June 20, 1792. (4) Letter of Terrier to the directory, 8 a. m., June 20, 1792. These four letters are also found in *Revue rétrospective*, 2e série, I, 163 ff., and in *Arch. parl.* (5) Letter of Terrier to the directory, 8 a. m., June 20, 1792 (second letter). (6) Letter of directory to Terrier, 9 a. m., June 20, 1792. (7) Letter of Terrier to directory, 9 a. m., June 20, 1792. Also found in *Proclamation du roi et recueil de pièces*, No. VIII.

h. Ternaux, I, 404.

(1) Extrait du procès-verbal des déclarations reçues par le juge de paix de la section des Tuileries sur la journée du 20 juin, daté au commencement du 25 juin, 1792. (2) Rapport d'Alexandre. (3) Extrait du rapport fait par Santerre au maire. (4) Ouverture de la porte de la cour royale, Laporte to Terrier, June 27, 1792. Original in Archives nationales, F[7]3688[1].

2. *Sources Independently Printed*

a. Documents.

(1) *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée nationale imprimé par son ordre.* Paris, 1792.

(2) Guingerlot. Declaration of Guingerlot, Lieut. Col. 30 Div. Gendarmerie, June 25. Also found in *Archives historiques, artistiques et litteraires*, II, 365, Paris, Etienne Charavay. Original in Arch. nat., F[7]3390. Guingerlot was on the scene and played an important rôle on June 20. This text is only a rough draft of his deposition.

(3) Rougeville, M. de. *Déposition sur les tristes événements de la journée du 20 juin, 1792, comme témoin oculaire et réflexions politiques par M. de Rougeville, Lieut. Col. de Cavalrie Chevalier des ordres militaires, St. Louis et de Cincinnatus.* Original in Arch. nat., C 222, No. 160[123].

(4) *L'almanach royal de 1792.*

b. Correspondence and Journals.

(1) Blanc-Gilli. *Lettre d'un député de l'assemblée nationale au département des Bouches-du-Rhône au sujet de l'attentat et des désordres commis au château des Tuileries, le 20 juin. Paris, 21 juin, 1792.* The original is in the Archives nationales, AD[1]102. Blanc-Gilli was an eye witness of the events he describes and wrote June 21. The letter is published in pamphlet form.

(2) Flammermont, Jules. *Négociations secrètes de Louis XVI et du baron de Breteuil avec la cour de Berlin (décembre 1791–juillet 1792).* Paris, 1885.

Digitized by Google

(3) Geraud, Edmond. *Journal d'un étudiant pendant la révolution, 1789–1793.* Chalmann Levy, Editor, 1890.

(4) Glagau, Hans. *Die französische Legislative und der Ursprung der Revolutionskriege, 1791–1792.* Berlin, 1896, p. 318–360. 1′. Mercy an Kaunitz, Brüssels, den 16 Mai, 1792; 2′. Mercy an Kaunitz, Brüssels, den 30 Mai, 1792; 3′. Pellenc an LaMarck, Paris, Ende Mai, 1792; 4′. Remarques sur l'état actuel du moment. (Diese Bemerkungen sind von Pellenc verfasst. Sie tragen kein datum. Am 13 Juni übersandte Mercy sie an den Fürsten Kaunitz. Editor's note.) 5′. Pellenc an LaMarck, Paris, den 24 Juni, 1792; 6′. Aus einem Schreiben Mercys an Kaunitz, Brüssel, den 27 Juni, 1792; 7′. Mercy an Kaunitz, Brüssel, den 2 Juli, 1792; 8′. Abbé Louis an Mercy, Paris, den 26 Juni, 1792; 9′. Pellenc an LaMarck, Paris, den 29 Juni, 1792; 10′. Pellenc an LaMarck, Paris, den 30 Juni, 1792; 11′. Pellenc an LaMarck, Paris, den 13–15 Juli, 1792.

(5) Goupilleau, Ph-Ch-Ai. *Lettre de député de la Vendée à l'assemblée législative, à la société populaire de Saint-Vincent de Nantes,* Fontenay, 1849. Goupilleau was an eye witness of and an actor in the events of June 20. He wrote his account at eleven o'clock the same night. Published in pamphlet form and found in Bibliothèque de la Ville de Paris.

(6) *Journal d'une bourgeoise pendant la révolution 1791–1793. Publiée par son petit-fils, Edouard Lockroy,* Paris, 1881. These letters were written by a woman to her son and to her husband. They were not written for publication. She was present in the assembly on June 20 and sent her servant to the Tuileries to see what passed there.

(7) Klinckowström, Baron R. M. de. *Le comte de Fersen et la cour de France. Extraits des papiers du grand maréchal de Suède, comte Jean Axel de Fersen.* 2 vols., Paris, 1878. Vol. II, p. 303, 307: 1′. Bulletin avec détails sur ce qui s'est passé aux Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792. (D'après l'original envoyé par le chargé d'affaires de Suède à Paris, Sr. Bergstedt, au comte de Fersen; dans les papiers de ce dernier.) 2′. Bulletin de ce qui s'est passé aux Tuileries le 20 juin, 1792, Paris, ce 21 juin, 1792. (D'après une lettre en chiffre d'une personne temoin oculaire. La lettre a été déchiffrée par un secrétaire du comte de Fersen.)

(8) La journée du 20 juin, 1792, recontée par un témoin. Extrait d'une lettre écrite de Paris en datte du 21 juin à Dupin et fils à Montpellier, in *Revue historique de la révolution française,* Vol. II, 597.

(9) Lescure, *Correspondance secrète inédite sur Louis XVI, Marie-*

Digitized by Google

Antoinette, la cour et la ville de 1777–1792. Publiée d'après les manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale de Saint-Pétersbourg, 2 vols., Paris, 1866. The author is unknown, but was evidently a person familiar with the political and diplomatic affairs of the court. The manuscript is found in Saint Petersburg marked F. 51, *Bulletins de Versailles,* 1777–1792.

(10) Lindet, Thomas. *Correspondance pendant la constituante et la législative* (*1789–1792*). Published by Amand Montier, Paris, 1899.

(11) Mirabeau et Le Comte de La Marck. *Correspondance pendant les années 1789, 1790, et 1791, recueillie, mise en ordre et publiée par M. Ad. de Bacourt,* 3 vols., Paris, 1851. 1′. Le comte de Montmorin au comte de la Marck, Paris, 22 mai, 1792; 2′. Le comte de Montmorin au comte de la Marck, Paris, 19 juin, 1792; 3′. Le comte de Montmorin au comte de la Marck, Paris, 21 juin, 1792.

(12) Morris, Gouverneur. *Diary and Letters.* Edited by Anne Cary Morris, 2 vols., New York, 1888.

(13) *A Residence in France during the Years 1792, 1793, 1794, 1795: Described in a Series of Letters from an English Lady with General and Incidental Remarks of the French Character and Manners.* Ed. by John Gifford, Esq.

(14) *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine,* Nov., 1908, contains: 1′. Fidèle exposé d'un événement qui a garanti d'une mort imminente la vie de S. A. R. Madame la Duchesse d'Angoulème. Letter of J. B. Mosneron to Louis XVIII, May 19, 1814; 2′. Lettre du comte Bigot de Préameneu au comte de Pastoret, Oct. 8, 1817, XI, 116.

(15) Vivenot, Alfred Ritter von. *Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserpolitik Oesterreichs während der französischen Revolutionskriege, 1790–1801.* 4 vols., Wien, 1873. Vol. II, p. 58, contains: 1′. Kaunitz an Mercy, Wien, den 26 Mai, 1792.

c. Contemporary Accounts.

(1) Azéma. "Les journées du 20 juin et du 10 août, 1792, racontées par Azéma, député de l'Aude à la législative." *La révolution française, XXVII.* Azéma was an eye witness of what he relates and wrote at eleven o'clock on the evening of June 20th.

(2) Bourcet. "Relation de la journée du 20 juin, 1792, faite par un garde nationale, témoin oculaire" in *Révolution française,* XVII, 72. This account was written by a former valet de chambre of the dauphin, who died in 1798. It was found among the papers of Mercy in the archives of Vienna, having been sent by Mercy to Kaunitz with a letter dated June 27, 1792. It gives a very

Digitized by Google

good account of the events of the day as seen by one who stood beside the king in the hall through which the crowd passed. The author, however, shows prejudice against the people and great devotion to the king. The document is not dated, but was evidently written before June 27. See note of Flammermont, *Révolution française*, XVII, 72.

(3) Young, Arthur. *Travels in France during the years 1787, 1788, 1789*, 4th Edition, London, 1892.

(*d*) PAMPHLETS.

(1) *Addresse au roi après la journée du 20 juin, 1792.* Anonymous. Extremely royalist in sentiment, giving nothing of value, but praising the king for his religious fortitude on June 20.

(2) *Au roi. Une addresse par Sanois ancien aide-major de vos gardes françaises.* June 21. One of the royalist addresses sent to the king expressing horror of the events of June 20. Gives no facts, but only shows sentiment.

(3) *Aux citoyens amis de la constitution par les fédéres.* Anonymous. This pamphlet is anti-Jacobin. It blames the Jacobins for many acts, among others for being the authors of June 20. Of value only as it reflects sentiment.

(4) *De l'affreuse conspiration qui vient d'être découverte par des members de l'assemblée nationale. Complot atroce d'engorger les députés patriotes de l'assemblée, M. Pétion, maire de Paris, les membres patriotes de la municipalité, du département et des sections patriotiques.* Extreme in sentiment, general in its accusations and gives nothing of value.

(5) *Déscription de la fête civique donnée au roi dans son château des Tuilleries par MM. Pétion et Santerre juin 20, 1792.* Arch. Nat., C 222, No. 160[102]. An anonymous pamphlet full of satire and bitter accusations. Extremely prejudiced, charging Pétion, Manuel, Santerre, the members of the assembly and of the directory with responsibility for the events of June 20.

(6) Drouet. *Note sur les événements dé la journée du 20 juin, 1792, par Charles François Drouet, Lieut. de chasseurs dans la garde nationale.* This writer was in the king's apartments June 20, 1792, but wrote his account twenty-four years later, in 1816. He relates the incidents of the day, but the account is full of inaccuracies and misstatements. He claims to have rendered to the king certain services which other evidence shows he did not render.

(7) Gouchon. *Grande discourse pronouncée par le patriote Gouchon au nom des citoyens du faubourg Saint-Antoine au sujet de la journée du 20 juin et pour justifier le peuple de Paris. Im-*

Digitized by Google

primée par ordre de l'assemblée nationale et envoyé à tous les départements. This pamphlet is an attempt on the part of the writer to justify himself and his fellows for the part they took on June 20, asserting that as fathers of families, citizens and soldiers they were right in what they did because of the oppression and plots of the king and nobles. He applauds the assembly for its attitude.

(8) Joly. *Note historique sur la journée du 20 juin, 1792, donnée par le Sr. Joly sergent des canonniers de la section du faubourg du Nord.* Written at Paris, March 20, 1816. Joly was a guard in the king's apartments on June 20. He is strongly royalist and, like Drouet, claims credit for services which he did not render. His memory did not serve him well, twenty-four years after the events.

(9) Lamar, l'abbé. *Les loisirs d'un curê deplacé ou les acts de l'église constitutionelle, tableau historique de la journeé du 20 juin ou le triomphe du bonnet rouge.* This pamphlet is found in a collection called *Pièces sur la révolution, journées fameuses,* Vol. III, *1791 à 10 août 1792.* Very prejudiced and very bitter in its tone. Makes sweeping accusations against the popular leaders and the people and charges them with crimes which the writer does not prove. He calls them regicides, bandits, cannibals, etc. He mentions various incidents of the day. Every statement needs to be carefully controlled.

(10) *Le cri de la douleur ou journée du 20 juin par l'auteur du Dominé salvem fac regem (extrait de la correspondance politique ou tableau de Paris des 22 et 24 juin).* Paris. Arch. nat. A. D. 102. Bitter in tone, royalist in sympathy, it makes many general and specific accusations which it does not prove. It can not be relied upon for statements of fact. It condemns in strong language the supposed leaders of the day, particularly the Girondins and Jacobins in the assembly.

(11) P. M. D. V. *Lettre au roi, presenté par ses fidèles sujets relativement à la journée, à jamais exécrable, du 20 juin, 1792.* Signed P. M. D. V. Another of the anonymous pamphlets which is of no value in giving facts, but which shows royalist sentiment. It is full of praise for the king and condemnation of the people for June 20.

(12) *Paroles d'un vrai Français après l'affreuse journée du 20 juin.* Anonymous. This is royalist and extremely bitter in its attacks on the supposed leaders of the uprising. It gives unstinted praise to the king. Is of no value except to reflect sentiment.

(13) *Preuves évidentes des trahisons de l'état-major coupable au premier chef du crime de lèse-nation; et fidelité heroique des sec-*

Digitized by Google

tions et des soldats patriotes. Par des citoyens des faubourgs. A Paris de l'imprimérie de la Vérité emplacement de la ci-devant Bastille, 1792. This was drawn up by the citizens of the faubourgs. It is full of praise for the leaders of the people and for all connected with the cause of liberty. It accuses the king of perfidy and the directory of subservience to him. It praises Pétion, Danton, Manuel, Robespierre, and shows the sentiment in the faubourgs.

(14) *Récit exact et circonstancié de ce qui s'est passé au château des Tuilleries le mercredi 20 juin, 1792.* Paris, imp. de J. Gérouard. *Extrait de la Gazette de Paris.* The editor of the *Gazette de Paris* was Durosoy. He says that for this account he followed the notes of an eye witness, who was at the king's side. The sentiment is markedly royalist, bitterly accusing the people of murderous intentions. It is extremely prejudiced, but evidently the account of an eye witness.

(15) *Récit générale et circonstancié des événements du vingt juin, 1792. Extrait du Courrier des 83 départements.* The original newspaper published by Gorsas bears the dates June 22 and 24. This account is full and accurate, though sympathy with the movement is clearly seen. Gorsas was an eye witness. The *Nouvelle correspondance politique,* XII, 1, date of June 22, 1792, a royalist paper, says Gorsas knows everything beforehand, when it is a question of an uprising.

(*e*) NEWSPAPERS.

(1) *Annales patriotiques et litteraires de la France, et affaires politiques de l'Europe; journal libre, par une société d'écrivains patriotes, dirigé par M. Mercier et par M. Carra, un des auteurs.* Nos. CLII, CLXXIII, CLXXIV, *Du Jeudi, 31 Mai, Jeudi 21 juin, Vendredi 22 juin, 1792.* Bib. nat., L²c. 249.

(2) *Chronique du mois ou les cahiers patriotiques de M. Clavière, 19 juin, 20 juin, 1792.* Bib. nat., L²c. 649.

(3) *Chronique de Paris. (Rédigée pour la partie de l'assemblée nationale par M. J. A. N. Condorcet.)* Daily. No. 174, *Jeudi 21 juin,* No. 175, *Vendredi 22 juin,* 172. Bib. nat., L²c. 218.

(4) *Corespondance politique des véritables amis du roi et de la patrie.* No. 63. *Du Jeudi 21 puin et du Samedi 23 juin, 1792.* Bib. nat., L²c. 661, 662. Account of June 20 written by an eye witness.

(5) *Gazette de France.* No. 86 and 87. *Du Jeudi 21,* and *Vendredi 22* juin, *1792.* Bib. nat., L²c. 1.

(6) *Journal de l'assemblée nationale ou Journal logographique.* Tome XXI, 1792. Bib. nat., L²c. 136. This journal gives the fullest and most faithful report of the meetings of the assembly on June 20, of any of the papers.

Digitized by Google

(7) *Journal des débats et des décrets.* Nos. 266, 267, 268. Bib. nat., L³c. 147. This gives a full account of the meetings of the assembly.

(8) *Journal du peuple, par Boyer.* No. 146. *Du Lundi 25 juin, 1792.* Bib. nat., L³c. 665.

(9) *Journal royalist par Barruel Beauvert.* Published every other day. Nos. 3–7. *Du Mercredi, 20, Vendredi 22, Dimanch 24, Mardi 26, Jeudi 28, juin, 1792.* Bib. nat., L³c. 664. The account of the events of June 20 was written by an eye witness.

(10) *L'indicateur ou Journal des causes et des effects.* Nos. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35. *Mercredi 20, Jeudi 21, Vendredi 22, Samdi 23, juin, 1792.* Daily.

(11) *Le mercure universel.* Daily. *Du jeudi 21 juin, 1792, et du vendredi, 22 juin, 1792.*

(12) *Le patriote français (par Brissot).* No. 1046. *Du Jeudi 21 juin, 1792.* Bib. nat., L³c. 185.

(13) *Le thermomètre du jour, par une société de gens de lettres, amis de la constitution, par J. A. Dulaure et B. Chaper, Paris, 11 août 1792–25 août 1793. Jeudi 21, et Samdi 23 juin, 1792.* Daily.

(14) *Moniteur. Réimpressions de l'ancien Moniteur depuis la réunion des états-généraux jusqu'au consulat (mai 1789–novembre 1799). Avec des notes.* 31 vols., Paris, 1840–1847. This gives a report of the meetings of the assembly of June 20, but not so faithful an account as is found in the *Journal de l'assemblée nationale.*

(15) *Nouvelle correspondance politique ou tableau de Paris. Pour servir de suite aux LII premiers numeros de la correspondance politique des véritables amis du roi et de la patrie.* No. XII, *Du Vendredi, 22 juin, 1792, Du Dimanche 24 juin, 1792.* Bib. Nat., L³c. 661, 662.

(16) *Révolutions de Paris, dediées à la nation et au district des Petits-Augustins. Publiées par L. Prudhomme, à l'époque du 12 juillet, 1789.* Paris, 1792.

(*f*) MÉMOIRES.

(1) Alexandre. Extracts in *Petites histoires,* 1 série, of Frédéric Masson (Paris, 1910) in the chapter entitled "L'invasion des Tuileries, Le 20 juin, 1792." The manuscript is the property of M. Masson. The portion of the *Mémoires* relating to June 20 was written later than the account contained in the Rapport d'Alexandre (Ternaux, I, 404 ff.) and differs from it in some details. Naturally the earlier account is the more trustworthy.

(2) Campan, Madame. *Mémoires sur la vie privée de Marie-Antoinette,* 3 vols., Paris, 1822.

Digitized by Google

(3) Chaumette. *Mémoires sur la révolution du 10 août, 1792, par F. A. Aulard,* Paris, 1893. Chaumette was active in revolutionary affairs from 1789 to 1794 and very influential. He was *procureur de la commune* in the latter part of 1792. He wrote his *mémoires* before the middle of 1793, for he speaks of the Girondins as adversaries yet living and refers to Pétion as living in May, 1793. (See page 33.) There is one indication that he may have written between Aug. 10 and Sept. 20, 1793. After speaking of the action of the assembly, Aug. 10, he praised it as worthy of the people it represented and expressed a wish that it might never lessen its energy (p. 64).

(4) Dumouriez. *La vie et les mémoires avec des notes et des éclaircissements historiques, par MM. Berville et Barrière.* 4 vols., Paris, 1822.

(5) Ferrières, Marquis de. *Mémoires,* 3 vols., par Berville et Barrière, Paris, 1821.

(6) Oelsner, Charles Englebert. "Fragments de ses mémoires rélatifs a l'histoire de la révolution française," *Revue historique,* Vols. LXIII, LXXXIII, LXXXIV, LXXXVII. These *mémoires* are published with notes by Alfred Stern. Oelsner was an eye witness of the events of June 20.

(7) Paroy, le comte de. *Mémoires du comte de Paroy, souvenirs d'un défenseur de la famille royal pendant la révolution (1789–1798). Publiées par Etienne Charavay,* Paris, 1895. This account was first published in 1836 by Villenave (in the *Revue de Paris*), who owned the manuscript. After his death, Charavay bought it. Paroy had apartments at the Tuileries. He was a close observer, spent much time in the gardens, cafés, and streets of Paris and in the evening gave an account to the people of the court of what had happened in these places. He was in the Tuileries, June 20, both in the apartments of the king and of the queen, and stood guard at the king's door all night (pp. 300–303). While his account is prejudiced because of his enmity to the revolution, it has much valuable material of a personal character. See the introduction by Charavay.

(8) Roederer, P. L. *Chronique de cinquante jours du 20 juin au 10 août,* Paris, 1832. While Roederer was an actor in some of the events of June 20, there is little in his account drawn from his own independent recollections. He wrote at least thirty years after the death of Louis XVI. (See paragraph one of his introduction in which he speaks of France having been under two different régimes of fifteen years each since that event.) He made use of the published documents accessible when he wrote, reconstructing the events of June 20 as the historian who has no first hand knowledge of an event is forced to do.

Digitized by Google

(9) Roland, Madame. *Mémoires, avec une notice sur sa vie, des notes et des éclaircissements historiques, par MM. Berville et Barrière.* 2 vols., Paris, 1827.

(10) Sergent-Marceau. *Notice historique sur les événements du 10 août, 1792, et des 20 et 21 juin précédents.* This account was published in the *Revue rétrospective,* 2e série, III, 328 ff. (1835). The account was written in 1828, according to the author's statements. He was one of the administrators of police and took a very active part in the events of June 20, leaving a declaration giving a full account of his work on that day. It is found in the collection published by the municipality under the title *Compte rendu, 1792.* The *Mémoires* has very little of value for June 20, giving chiefly the author's interpretation of the uprising as seen through the vista of the years.

(11) Weber. *Mémoires concernant Marie Antoinette, archiduchesse d'Autriche et reine de France et de Navarre.* 2 vols., Paris, 1822. Weber reproduces a few letters of eye witnesses describing the events of June 20.

II. SECONDARY WORKS.

1. Aulard, A. *Etudes et leçons sur la révolution française,* Quatrième série, Paris, 1904.
2. Aulard, A.: *Histoire politique de la révolution française,* Paris, 1901.
3. Aulard, A.: *Les républicans et les démocrats depuis le massacre du Champ de Mars jusqu'à la journée du 20 juin, 1792,* in *Révolution française,* XXXV, 1898.
4. Berty, Adolph. *Topographie historique du vieux Paris,* 5 vols., Paris, 1866.
5. Blanc, Louis, *Histoire de la révolution française,* 15 vols., Nouvelle édition, Paris, 1878.
6. Brette, Armand, *Histoire des édifices où ont siègé les assemblées parlementaires de la révolution française et de la première république,* Paris, 1902.
7. *Cambridge Modern History,* Planned by Lord Acton, edited by A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero and Stanley Leathes, Vol. VIII, *The French Revolution,* New York.
8. Caron, Pierre. "Le tentative de contre-révolution de juin-juillet, 1789," in *Revue d'histoire moderne,* VIII, 5–34, 649–678.
9. Carro, A. *Santerre, général de la république française, sa vie politique et privée, écrite d'après les documents originaux laissés par lui et les notes d'Augustin Santerre, son fils aîné,* 2d edition, Meaux, 1869. A superficial work, of little value, showing little evidence either of "original documents" or of "notes of Augustin Santerre."

Digitized by Google

10. Champion, Edme. *La France d'après les cahiers de 1789,* Paris, 1897.
11. Christophelsmeier, Carl. "The First Revolutionary Step," in *University Studies,* University of Nebraska, January, 1909.
12. Clapham, J. H. *The Causes of the War of 1792,* Cambridge, 1899.
13. Dreyfus, Maurice, *Les femmes de la révolution française,* 1789–1795, Paris, 1903.
14. Flammermont, Jules. *Le 14 juillet, 1789.* Paris, 1892.
15. Fling, F. M. "The Oath of the Tennis Court," *University Studies,* University of Nebraska, October, 1899.
16. Glagau, Hans, *Die französische Legislative und der Ursprung der Revolutionskriege, 1791–1792,* Berlin, 1896.
17. Hatin, Eugène, *Bibliographie historique et critique de la presse périodique française,* Paris, 1866.
18. Kuscinski, *Les députés à l'assemblée législative de 1791,* Paris, 1900.
19. Lacroix, Sigismond, *Le département de Paris et de la Seine pendant la révolution.* Paris, 1904.
20. Martin, Fernand. *La journée des piques. Le 20 juin, 1792,* Clermont-Ferrand, 1901. P. Juliôt, 15 Rue de l'eau. This work has no scientific value whatever.
21. Masson, Frédéric, *Petites histoires,* 1 série, Paris, 1910.
22. Mellié, Ernest, *Les sections de Paris pendant la révolution française,* Paris, 1898.
23. Robiquet, Paul. *Le personel municipal de Paris pendant la révolution.* Paris, 1890.
24. Sorel, Albert. *L'Europe et la révolution française,* 4 vols., Paris, 1889.
25. Stephens, H. Morse. *The French Revolution,* 2 vols., New York, 1886.
26. Stoddard, Julia Crewett. "The Causes of the Insurrection of the 5th and 6th of October, 1789," *University Studies,* University of Nebraska, October, 1904.
27. Sybel, Heinrich von. *History of the French Revolution,* 4 vols., London, 1867.
28. Ternaux, Mortimer. *Histoire de la terreur, 1792–1794.* 5 vols., Paris, 1868.
29. Tourneux, Maurice. *Bibliographie de l'histoire de Paris, pendant la révolution française,* 3 vols., Paris, 1890–1900.
30. Tuetey, Alexandre, *Repertoire général des sources manuscrites de l'histoire de Paris pendant la révolution française,* 9 vols., Paris, 1890–1910.
31. Varenne, Maton-de-la-, *Histoire particulière des événements qui ont eu lieu en France pendant les mois de juin, juillet, d'août, et de septembre, 1792, et qui ont opéré la chute du trône royal.* Paris, 1806. A very prejudiced account and based on the *Récit historique et exact,* the authorship of which is not given.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

TE

[illegible]	
[illegible]	
MAY 1 2 1963	
Stamp	
INTER-LIBRARY LOAN	
FEB 4 1965	

LD 21A–50m-11,'62
(D3279s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Digitized by Google

YC 7491

288014
Pfeiffer
DC173
.62
P3
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google